

BOTH SIDES

—ON—

THE SABBATH AND LAW.

REVIEW OF T. M. PREBLE.

.....
BY URIAH SMITH.
.....

ASC

BV

125

.S63

1864

HER.

in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor
harm him." Prov. xviii, 17.

STEAM PRESS

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.
LITTLE CREEK, MICH.

1864.

1842

BOTH SIDES

-ON-

THE SABBATH AND LAW.

REVIEW OF T. M. PREBLE.

BY URIAH SMITH.

~~~~~  
"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor  
cometh and searcheth him." PROV. XVIII, 17.  
~~~~~

STEAM PRESS
OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

1864.

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER

James White Library

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

E. G. Farnsworth

REVIEW OF PREBLE.

A NUMBER of articles have lately appeared in the World's Crisis, from the pen of T. M. Preble, under the title of "The seventh-day Sabbath—The Law. The Old 'Dead Schoolmaster!' The Living Jesus." It is well known that Eld. Preble first called the attention of Adventists to the Sabbath, by some essays in its favor, in 1845; and though he soon gave it up, others commenced its advocacy, and the work has moved steadily on until fourteen or fifteen thousand Seventh-day Adventists are now, in obedience to the command of the Lord by the prophet, Isa. lviii, 13, calling "the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, and honorable." It will interest such to learn by what means Eld. P. came to consider it a yoke of bondage which he was not able to bear. The subject is confessedly one of importance. The Sabbath is introduced to us on the opening page of revelation. It bears a prominent place in all the instructions which God has given his people in any age or dispensation, touching their duties to himself. It is an institution that he has ever claimed as peculiarly his own, committing it to man only as a heavenly keepsake, and a memorial of his great and glorious name. He is jealous of his praise and glory, and has declared that his honor is involved in the keeping of his Sabbath. Thus says the prophet: "If thou turn away thy foot from

ASC

BV

125

563

1864

Her.

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

#5394974.

the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable, and shalt *honor* him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words, then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isa. lviii, 13, 14. Aside from the gracious promise contained in this scripture for the faithful Sabbath-keeper, we learn that to refrain from our own ways, finding our own pleasure, or speaking our own words, on the Sabbath, was, anciently, at least, to *honor* the Most High. We should beware, therefore, how we hastily decide against this institution, lest haply we be found to fight against God; for no amount of honor bestowed upon the Son, no amount of professed reverence for the living Jesus, will compensate for the least dishonor offered to the great Jehovah, inasmuch as our Saviour has expressly declared that he and his Father are one.

We propose, therefore, to carefully and candidly consider Eld. Preble's present position; and in doing this, we shall let him speak for himself, giving his entire article, simply dividing it into such portions as are convenient for reply. He enters upon his subject as follows:

"MY EXPERIENCE. TO THE SAINTS SCATTERED ABROAD, GREETING:—MY BRETHREN: I have once been an observer of the *seventh-day Sabbath*! This was from about the middle of the year 1844, to the middle of 1847; when, becoming convinced that I was wrong, I gave it up, and returned to the observance of the '*first-day*' again.

"As I wrote and published some upon this subject,

and a few of the '*tracts*' are yet in being, Sabbatarians are making what use they can of them to advance their cause. Wishing to atone in part, or as far as I am able, for the evils I may have done in publishing so far as I did this error; and especially as many have solicited my reasons for the change of my views, and what scriptural grounds I have for my present position; I deem it my duty to publish still more; but *now on the right side of the question.*"

"Where it is deemed good policy, I learn that some are trying to make all the capital out of my old tract on the seventh-day Sabbath they can, and sometimes appear to place about as much confidence in reading it to their hearers, to establish the doctrine of Sabbatarians, as they do in reading from the Bible; and say that I am now a '*backslider*,' and '*going to perdition*,' because of my return to the observance of the '*first day*!'"

"As I have several letters now on hand, soliciting my views on the Sabbath question, which I have been unable to answer of late, in consequence of sickness in my family, and other cares and labors: I deem it my duty to prepare an article for the paper, and if the *Crisis* will have the goodness to speak for me on this vexing or '*bewitching*' question, I hope it will prove to be a satisfactory answer to my friends; and others, who are interested in this subject, be benefited by it, in these last days of temptation and trial. *Amen.*"

REPLY.—The interest of others whose attention has been called to this subject, has not proved so transient as Eld. P.'s, but on the other hand has deepened with their increasing experience and further light. The '*evil*,' if such it be, is increasing. The prospect before the Sabbath cause was never more encouraging, nor the halo of light that encompasses the subject more bright and glorious. The ball has been set in motion; and it bids fair to be even like the barley loaf that tumbled into the camp of the Midianites, laying prostrate their tents and leading on to perfect victory. To

arrest this work will require more than his present effort. He will need to send forth publications which can cope with such works as the History of the Sabbath by J. N. Andrews, which not only has not been answered, but remains to be even attacked. We would not however counsel him to any such effort; for we sincerely regard him as laboring under a deception, and pursuing a course, in which if he continues, he will suffer loss in the day that cometh, which shall try every man's work of what sort it is. He cannot plead like many who are now keeping the first-day, that he has never had the light on the subject, although it may be proper to add that the light that had come forth upon this question at the time he bade farewell to God's great memorial, was not a tithe of what it is now. Still it is not without something of marvel that we behold a man turning away from a position on which the light gleamed however faintly, to one which could boast of nothing but total darkness.

He speaks of this "bewitching" question. If by this he would imply that people are ever bewitched into the keeping of the seventh instead of the first-day, we would suggest that he has applied the term to the wrong side of the question. Neither revelation nor experience furnish an instance of a person's being bewitched into a practice that calls for increased sacrifice, self-denial, and separation from the world, which are more or less involved in the keeping of the Sabbath, while we do have instances of just the reverse. Paul reproved his Galatian converts for being bewitched that they should *not* obey the truth. The witchery always operates in behalf of a lower standard and an easier position; hence it would not be strange if Sunday, complacently arraying itself in the

robe of popular favor, and popular practice, and pointing to a broad and easy way in which the multitude travel, should beguile the ease-loving and unstable. May God save his people from being dazzled with the tinsel and glitter of the false and the counterfeit.

But our friend has a confession to make to which we will now listen:

Preble.—"MY CONFESSION.—Here let me now confess, that if there is any one day mentioned in the Scriptures which is *now* more 'holy' than another, made so by the express or direct command of Almighty God, then the 'seventh day' is the one. And as I have often said, within the last fifteen years, to those who have questioned me on this subject, that if they would point out one single text to me in the *New Testament* that will show that the seventh day is *now* more 'holy' than another, and that it thus proves that Christians should observe it as '*holy*' time, then I will observe with them the next seventh day; and will preach and practice after that, the observance of the 'seventh-day Sabbath,' as in former years. But not a man of them has yet, neither can they show this. Many, both in public and in private, have been silenced in this way, and have never opened their mouth to me on the seventh-day Sabbath question, after this statement. This statement stands good against me yet, and if any Sabbatarians wish me to observe with them again the seventh day, let them just comply with the above request, and they will find me true to my word. This puts the laboring oar into their hands. Let them use it if they can."

REPLY.—In the above, Eld. P. has indeed "witnessed a good confession," in the admission that if any one day is now more holy than another, "the seventh day is the one." No day can be holy except made so by the command of Almighty God; hence if the seventh day is not now holy, there is no holy time in this dispensation. Let the reader set this down as Waymark

No. 1. We shall have more or less occasion to refer to it as we proceed. The remainder of the paragraph is occupied with the stale and incessant clamor for testimony from the *New Testament* that the seventh day is now holy, or for a *repetition* of God's command for its observance.

He adroitly endeavors to put the laboring oar into our hands. We beg leave, however, to decline said oar, and think we can show him that it is still in his charge. Prove to him, he says, that the seventh day is now holy, and he will observe it; to which we might respond, Prove to us that it is *not* holy, and we will immediately cease its observance. The commandment must be repeated in the New Testament before he can believe it to be binding. But we would ask him to give a moment's serious thought to this one question. *Why* should the commandment be repeated in the New Testament, or why should we expect it? We know that the seventh day was once to be regarded as holy time by the express command of God; we know that its observance was once binding. Now it must be apparent to all that there is no need of re-asserting its holiness, or repeating the law for its observance, unless it can be shown to have been abolished. But if he asserts that it has been abolished, then we say, *Let him prove it*; for here we deny and he affirms. It is an established principle, and all logicians will sustain it, that all the presumption lies "in favor of the old opinion and established usage;" and any institution which is known to have been once firmly established, is presumed to be still in existence, unless it can be shown why and when it was to cease, or did cease, to exist. Again we say, if he would have us turn with him from the seventh day to the first day,

let him show (and no man is better able to show) where the former has been done away. But when he has done this, the work is only half accomplished; for a law yet remains to be found enforcing the new institution. Thus a double burden of proof is found resting upon his shoulders; let him dispose of it if he can. When he will prove what we have shown to be incumbent on him to prove, we will join him in his present position, and again observe the first-day Sabbath as in former years. His objection goes upon the ground that all our duty is enjoined in the New Testament, which we will set down as Fallacy No. 1, and shall consider it in another place.

Preble.—"WE SHOULD BE NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIANS. For any one to start a subject *founded* upon the Old Testament Scriptures, and then try to make the New Testament *conform* to it, instead of taking their starting-point in the *New*, and then see that the Old is made to harmonize with this, *that* is putting a 'yoke' upon their own 'necks,' and upon the necks of others who are made to believe them, '*which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear.*' And as the apostle says to the Corinthians:

"But their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their hearts. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away." 2 Cor. iii, 14-16.

"And I will repeat that at 'this day,' many 'minds are blinded,' because 'the same veil' remains 'untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament;' and it is a great pity that men will not turn their 'hearts' to the Lord Jesus; then 'the veil shall be taken away,' and thus be no longer 'upon their hearts.' But if men are determined to go it 'BLIND,' the '*ditch*' must take them up."

REPLY.—With the statement that we should be New-Testament Christians, we heartily sympathize. "*The faith of Jesus*" is by no means a small item of our belief. But do we fall from grace, or come under the curse, because we connect therewith that great rule of moral rectitude, the commandments of God? "*The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus,*" this same New Testament holds up together as the characteristics of the true people of God, just before the coming of Christ. Rev. xiv, 12. But must we, to be New-Testament Christians, reject the Old Testament? If the New Testament is a complete standard in itself, and the Old is only something which is to be "made to harmonize" with it, we might just as well cast it one side at once. But so far is this from being the case that we will lay down the proposition that there is not a single new principle of morality introduced in the New Testament, *not one*. They are all found in the Old, and from that are quoted into the New. Christ and his apostles appealed to the Old as their authority. By it they enforced the claims of their mission. By it they established the truths of the gospel. The Old Testament is the very foundation of the New. Without it the New never could have had an existence. Separate the New from the Old, and the New dies, as surely as a branch when detached from its parent stock. With every New-Testament writer, an appeal to the Old is an end of all controversy. Far be it from us to esteem or treat it any less lightly. It is a part of God's infallible revelation of his will to man. It is the testimony of holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The words of the Lord in the Old as well as the New Testament, are pure words,

and from Genesis to Revelation they are dear and precious unto us.

In regard to the vail that Paul told the Corinthians was upon the hearts of the children of Israel, 2 Cor. iii, the testimony had reference to the *ministration* of the law, not to any moral principle whatever. Here he falls into Fallacy No. 2. The law, and the ministration of the law, are two things. There is no sane man living that we know of, except the Jews, who believes that the former ministration is still in force. We have turned our hearts unto the Lord Jesus, and we behold him enjoining obedience to all his Father's commandments, declaring that not one jot or tittle should pass from the law till all (not all the law, but *all things*, Greek,) should be fulfilled. We find him throughout his whole ministry laboring to vindicate the Sabbath from Pharisaic abuse, defining what was lawful, or according to the Sabbath law, to be done on that day. We find him commending it to the peculiar affection of his disciples by styling himself its Lord. If we love the Lord of the Sabbath, we should also love his Sabbath. And finally, we behold him dying upon the cross, for our transgressions of the law, and not for ours only, but for those also under the former dispensation. Man had sinned; but the law that he had violated could not be set aside. He, or a substitute, must die. God could give up his only son to death, but he could not violate the integrity of his government, by abrogating or relaxing in the least degree, the claims of his holy law. And to him who reads revelation aright, no scene could more impressively set forth the immutability and perpetuity of the law of God, than the darkened heavens, the trembling earth, and the expiring agonies of the Lord Jesus, on the day

concerning meats and drinks, in like manner as he spoke the Sabbath? Never. Did he write anything about them on the tables of stone where he engraved the commandment for the observance of his rest-day? Not a word. The Sabbath belongs to entirely another system, to which the 14th chapter of Romans makes no sort of reference whatever.

Preble.—"REASONS FOR MY GIVING UP THE SEVENTH DAY. During the whole period of the three years that I observed the seventh day as the Sabbath, no one was ever able, that I met with, to meet my arguments, and no argument adduced by others ever affected my mind in the least degree, until in a correspondence with Eld. Joseph Marsh in the 'Voice of Truth,' in answer to questions I proposed to him on this subject, he, among other things, proposed to me this question: 'ARE THE GENTILES A TYPICAL PEOPLE?' This question opened to me a new door of thought; and after full three weeks of careful review of this whole question, I became satisfied that I was wrong, and then I confessed my error. And from that day to this, not a shadow of a doubt has passed my mind in regard to my present position."

REPLY.—The question as to whether or not the Gentiles are a typical people, is not difficult to answer. Of course they are not. But what of that! We should have been glad had Eld. P. led us through his "door of thought" that we also might have explored the hidden mysteries of the new apartment that was opened to him. As it is, we are left to make the following inference: The Gentiles are not a typical people, hence have nothing to do with types: the Sabbath is a type, hence they have nothing to do with that. The whole objection, then, resolves itself into this one assumption, that the Sabbath is a type. And is this his reason for "giving up the seventh day?" Was he so feebly grounded in his position that a paper sail-

ing under the false title of the "Voice of Truth," could, by merely making a suggestion based on this assumption, overthrow him? Was he so weak in the truth as to be unable to stand before this, one of the flimsiest objections against the Sabbath that ever issued from the realm of darkness? That the Sabbath is not a type, will be shown in its proper place.

Preble.—"THE SABBATH A "SIGN" UNTO THE "CHILDREN OF ISRAEL," AND UNTO THEM ONLY. I know that Sabbatarians *deny* this, but I shall *prove* it, their denial to the contrary notwithstanding. Proof:

"Speak thou also unto the *children of Israel*, saying, Verily *my Sabbaths* ye shall keep: for it is a sign between *me* and *you* throughout *your* generations; that *ye* may know that I *am* the Lord that doth sanctify *you*. *Ye* shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto *you*. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth *any* work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. *Six* days may work be done; but in the *seventh* is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth *any* work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the *children of Israel* shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between *me* and the *children of Israel* forever: in *six* days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the *seventh* day he rested and was refreshed.' Ex. xxxi, 13-17.

"For the sake of brevity, and for emphasis or greater force, the reader will notice that I have taken the liberty to *italicize* a few words in my quotations from the Scriptures. I shall be pardoned in this, I trust. But still more proof:

"Wherefore I caused *them* to go forth out of the land of *Egypt*, and brought *them* into the wilderness. And I gave *them* my statutes, and showed *them* my judgments, which if a man do he shall even live in them. Moreover also I gave *them* *my Sabbaths*, to be a sign between *me* and *them*, that *they* might know that I *am* the Lord that sanctify *them*.' Eze. xxix, 10-12.

"The passage just quoted from Eze. xxxi, proves positively that the Sabbath referred to is 'the seventh-day' Sabbath, 'the Sabbath of rest,' the one called 'holy to the Lord:' and yet the LORD JEHOVAH says, 'It is a sign between him and 'the children of Israel.' How long? 'Throughout their generations.' And let all God's people say, *Amen*. How long did the generations of the children of Israel continue? See Matt. i, 1, 17. 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the son of Abraham. So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations.'

"Let any one find the generations of the children of Israel to continue any longer than 'until John,' or until Christ, if they can. Let God be true, though 'the seventh-day Sabbath' perish!"

REPLY.—It is a characteristic of truth that it can always afford to be fair, and not unfrequently can concede the greater portion of the claims of its opponents, without compromising its position. And for our own part, we always like to get as near to an opponent as possible, agreeing with his positions as far as we can, and differing only where we are compelled to differ by the plain testimony of the case. We can thus make the reasons for that difference the more apparent. We shall *not* therefore deny that the Sabbath was a sign unto the children of Israel. We will take as literally as any of our opponents could wish, everything that the Bible says about the Sabbath's being a sign between God and Israel, or, if they like it any better, between God and the Jews. But when Eld. P. adds, "*and them only*," we would remind him that that is an interpolation of his own! the Bible says nothing of the kind. Take the very strongest testimony which de-

clares that the Sabbath was given to Israel to be a sign between God and them, a sign throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant, &c., and even in that we find no evidence either expressed or implied, that the Sabbath *could not* be a sign between God and anybody else, at that time, or before, or since.

Here Eld. P. is guilty of Fallacy No. 3, by assuming that a fact cannot have a general application, because it is only stated to be true in a particular instance. But as the opponents of the Sabbath uniformly try to make great capital out of this fact, that the Sabbath was a sign to the Hebrews, we will notice it more at length.

1. Why were Israel set apart as they were from all nations? It was not the Sabbath that set them apart, but God set them apart because all other nations had given themselves to idolatry. Finding the family of Abraham faithful, he took this means to preserve his truth, a knowledge of himself, and his worship in the earth. Thus they were made for a time the depositaries and guardians not of the Sabbath only, but of all divine truth.

2. As the most expressive sign that could exist between God and his people, he gave them his Sabbath. But what were the reasons on which that sign was based. Was it to signify their deliverance from Egypt? It was not. Was it based on any reason peculiarly Jewish? It was not. But it pointed back to the beginning for its origin; and the reason given for it was, because God in six days made heaven and earth, and rested on the seventh. The Sabbath, therefore, on the part of the people signified that they were worshipers of the true God; and on the part of God, it signified that he who sanctified them was the great Jehovah,

the maker of heaven and earth. It was a sign, therefore, because God in six days made heaven and earth. Aside from this fact it could not have been a sign even to Israel; but in the great events of creation week, other nations have an equal interest with the Jews; and when a Gentile, in the former dispensation, joined himself to that people, did not the Sabbath become a sign to him just as much as to the Jews? No one will deny it. And when, finally, the middle wall of partition was broken down, and the Gentiles were taken in to be fellow-heirs with them of the promises of God, would it not be equally a sign to them? We see, then, that the Sabbath had nothing Jewish in its nature. It is God's great memorial, and the only memorial of himself ever given to man. It is the great bulwark against atheism and idolatry. In view of these facts, it is no less than absurd to say that it was not designed for all nations, or not to be observed by all who owe allegiance to God. The Jews were for a while its only observers, just as they were the only observers of other of God's commandments; because all other nations had apostatized from him.

3. But, it may be urged, the Sabbath is said to have been *given* to the Jews, hence it became Jewish, and limited to that people. Will the objector take the ground that whatever was given to the Jews, became Jewish, and was to cease with the existence of that people as a nation? This is the position he must take to make his objection against the Sabbath valid; but if he takes it, it will not take long to land him in the deepest bogs of atheism; for God gave *himself* to that people to the same extent, and even more emphatically than he did his Sabbath. He declared that he brought Israel up out of the land of Egypt *to be their*

God. Lev. xi, 45. He styled himself the God of the Hebrews, and the God of Israel. Gen. xvii, 7, 8; Ex. iii, 18; Isa. xlv, 3. Did he thus become Jewish, and cease 1800 years ago? If such expressions as these could be found relative to the Sabbath; if we could read that God brought them up out of Egypt *to give* them the Sabbath; that he gave it to them to be *their* Sabbath, or find where it is called the Sabbath of the Hebrews, and the Sabbath of Israel, there would be more plausibility in the position of our opponents; but even then, their claim would not be proved; because God, who applies all these expressions to himself, is not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also. Rom. iii, 29.

4. It is still objected that the giving of the Sabbath to Israel shows that it was not before known, but had its origin with that people. Too fast again; for the children of Israel had the Sabbath at least a month previous to coming to Sinai, where Nehemiah says it was made known to them. This expression can therefore only signify its more complete unfolding. A striking illustration of this point is found in Eze. xx, 5, where God is said to have made *himself* known unto Israel in Egypt; yet they were not ignorant of the true God up to that time; for they had been his peculiar people since the days of Abraham. The language in both cases would rather imply the prior existence of the true God and of the Sabbath. This objection is again shown to be groundless by the Saviour's language respecting circumcision: John vii, 22: "Moses therefore *gave* unto you circumcision, not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;" yet God had enjoined that ordinance upon Abraham and his family four hundred years previous, and it had been retained

by them. The conclusion is therefore apparent that if the declaration that Moses gave them circumcision does not show that it had its origin at that time, neither does the statement that God gave to Israel his Sabbath, prove that it originated with them.

5. But it was only to last through their generations. Who says that? Not the Bible, by any means. But how long a time is meant by their generations? Eld. P., by a peculiar process, attempts to cut it short at John or Christ, seemingly in doubt which. The testimony he quotes, however, to prove the length of "the generations of the *children of Israel*," unfortunately for him only reads, "The book of the generation of *Jesus Christ*!" Are Jesus Christ and the children of Israel synonymous terms! The only definition that can be given to the word generation as applied to the existence of a particular class of people or a nation, is, the regular succession of descendants, from father to son. To make good his position, therefore, that the generations of Israel ceased with Christ, he must show that not a single Jew has been born since the birth of Christ, but that through the agency of some stupendous miracle the vitality of the nation suddenly ceased, and the race expired with the generation then living! The generations of Israel have assuredly not yet ceased; and if the Sabbath is not now binding, it must be accounted for on other ground than this. But not to press this point, suppose we admit that the generations of the Jews, in a scriptural sense, did cease at the cross. What then? Would this contain anything to show that the Sabbath must then cease, or that it could not be a sign between God and any other people who should become his worshipers after that? Nothing at all; for it would still be true that the Sabbath was to

them a sign throughout their generations, even though it continued to exist after their generations ceased.

6. The expression, "throughout your generations," even allowing the generations to be literal, and to cease at the cross, does *not* of itself limit the existence of any institution or ordinance. Proof. Lev. iii, 17. It was a perpetual statute for Israel throughout their generations, to eat no blood: yet the same prohibition rested upon Noah, before Israel had an existence; Gen. ix, 4; and after, as it is claimed, the generations of Israel ceased, the same prohibition was still obligatory upon the Gentiles. Acts xv, 20. Can any man living show why it may not be exactly thus with the Sabbath?

7. But the Sabbath by being a sign became a shadow, and hence was to cease with the typical dispensation. And who says this? There is certainly no Bible statement for it. There is nothing in the meaning of the word sign, to show that it is a type or shadow. A sign is one thing, a type or shadow, is entirely another and a different thing. A sign is simply that by which a certain relation or state is signified; a type is that which foreshadows, or points forward to, something. Types always point forward, but the Sabbath as a sign between God and Israel, pointed back to the works of creation, and signified that the author of those works, the maker of heaven and earth, was their God. To still more utterly demolish this objection, we introduce the following from the History of the Sabbath, pp. 56, 57: "As a sign it [the Sabbath] did not thereby become a shadow and a ceremony; for the Lord of the Sabbath was himself a sign. 'Behold I, and the children whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts which dwelleth in mount Zion.' Isa. viii, 18. In Heb

ii, 13, this language is referred to Christ. 'And Simon blessed them, and said unto Mary, his mother, Behold this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign which shall be spoken against.' Luke ii, 34. That the Sabbath was a sign between God and Israel, throughout their generations, that is, for the time they were his peculiar people, no more proves that it is now abolished, than the fact that Jesus is now a sign that is spoken against, proves that he will cease to exist when he shall no longer be such a sign."

8. Do the scriptures that speak of the Sabbath as a sign between God and Israel, teach that it was made for Israel? Nothing of the kind.

9. Do they teach that it was made after Israel came out of Egypt? No intimation of any such thing.

10. Do they even seem to contradict those other scriptures which place the origin of the Sabbath at creation? Not at all.

Therefore, allowing the generations to be exclusively literal, and allowing that they ceased with Christ, we submit, that it does not in the least degree affect the origin of the Sabbath, or the perpetuity of that divine institution. And if an argument was ever produced, more thoroughly futile than this against the Sabbath, we should be happy to see it. For our own part, we rejoice that the Sabbath was a sign between God and Israel. We rejoice that God conferred upon it such a signal honor as to take it, in preference to any of his other commandments, to be the badge of his loyal people in the midst of a world of apostates and rebels.

Preble.—"OF WHAT IS THE SABBATH A SIGN OR TYPE? Should the inquiry be raised by the objector,

whether I do not believe the seventh-day Sabbath of the Old Testament is a type of the seventh millennium, or thousand years; I answer, yes. Then, says the objector, How can you make out that the type will cease to be observed until the antitype is reached? I answer, the same as other types ceased to be observed, or kept, before the antitypes were reached: as for example, look at the 'high priest' who went into 'the holy place' once every year:—

"The Holy Ghost *this signifying*, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing; which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them *until the time of reformation*. But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, *having obtained eternal redemption for us.*" Heb. ix, 8-12.

"This says,—'*Having obtained eternal redemption for us.*' But we have not really obtained this redemption yet; neither can we, until Christ comes '*the second time without sin unto salvation.*'"

"For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into *heaven itself*, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he *appeared* to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear, the second time, without sin unto salvation.' Heb. ix, 24-28.

"Thus, we see, that the Levitical priesthood was a type of the priesthood of Christ; but the Levitical priesthood has been 'changed,' and, hence, the type has *ceased* to be observed; as we read in Heb. vii, 11, 12;—

"If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the *priesthood being changed*, there is made of necessity a change also of the law."

"But let us examine this still more, and see how clearly we can establish the fact, that the priesthood of Christ is the antitype of the Levitical priesthood; and although the type has *ceased* to be observed, yet the antitype is *not yet reached* in its completion:—

"For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchizedek there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Heb. vii, 13-16.

"Mark this last expression:—Our 'priest' is made 'not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of AN ENDLESS LIFE.' But again:—

"By so much as Jesus made a *surety* of a better testament. And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an *unchangeable* priesthood." Heb. vii, 22-24.

"Yes, praise God:—By so much as Jesus made a *surety* of a better testament." (Verse 22.)

"And so it is with the Sabbath, it was a sign or type of that 'rest'—or 'keeping of a Sabbath,' (margin)—which 'remaineth' 'to the people of God' (Heb. iv, 9); but as 'the body is of Christ' (Col. ii, 16, 17), we cannot trace the 'shadow' beyond the 'body': but Christ has become our '*surety*' of that 'rest' the same

as he was made 'a surety of a better testament.' And as Christ does not fulfill the type of the priesthood until he comes out of the holy of holies, or out of 'heaven itself,' to give 'the people of God' 'an *endless* life;' so the type of the Sabbath will not be fulfilled until Christ comes out 'heaven itself' to give 'the people of God' that 'rest' which 'remaineth' for them.' And as the apostle says:—

"Now of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum: We have such an *high priest*, who is set on the *right hand* of the *throne* of the *Majesty* in the *heavens*; a minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the *example* and *shadow* of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle; for see, saith he, that thou make all things according to the *pattern* showed to thee in the mount. But now hath he obtained a more excellent *ministry*, by how much also he is the *mediator* of a better covenant, which was established upon *better promises*." Heb. viii, 1-6."

REPLY.—Of what, asks Eld. P., is the Sabbath a sign or type? Mark the expression, "a sign or type!" Here he is guilty of Fallacy No. 4, by connecting the word type with the word sign, thereby covertly insinuating that they mean one and the same thing. We have already alluded to the distinction between a sign and a type. The word used for sign, where the Sabbath is called a sign, is *σημεῖον*, which is defined thus: "A sign; i. e., a mark, token, by which anything is known or distinguished; a token, pledge, assurance; a proof, evidence, convincing token," &c. The word for type, is a very different word, namely, *τύπος*, which is defined, "A mark, impression, print of a stroke or

blow; a form, image, effigy, i. e., a statue; pattern, model; a type, figure, emblem, that which exhibits a representation or likeness of anything," &c. The word for shadow, as in the expression, "A shadow of things to come," Col. ii, 17, is still another word, namely, *σκιά*, and is defined as follows: "A shade, a shadow; metaphorically, a shadow, i. e., a shadowing forth, adumbration, in distinction from the perfect image or delineation, and the reality." From these definitions the reader will see the plain distinction there is between a sign, and a type or shadow, and how utterly erroneous it is to confound the one with the other.

But nevertheless Eld. P. has announced his belief that the Sabbath is a type. He considers it a type of the seventh millenium; though from some oversight, or perhaps from necessity, he has omitted to give us any evidence for that position. We do not believe the Sabbath is a type pointing forward to our future rest, but a memorial looking back to creation; for the Scriptures uniformly and expressly so represent it. Could he have given as good a reason for his position, would he not have produced it? There is an insuperable objection that lies against his view, which he has mentioned, but not removed. It is that if the Sabbath is a type of the future millennium, it reaches up to that time, and should be observed till then. No man can avoid this conclusion. Yet Eld. P.'s position that the Sabbath is abolished, obliges him to take the view that the type has ceased, before the antitype is reached. He endeavors, however, to extricate himself from this dilemma by the assertion that other types have ceased before reaching their antitypes, and that this is of the same nature with them. Here we meet his

assertion with a universal and unqualified denial. No type can cease until its antitype is reached. Common sense forbids the idea. His lengthy quotations from Scripture to show that the priesthood of Christ is the antitype of the Levitical priesthood, so far as our belief in that doctrine is concerned, might have been omitted. There is no controversy on that. But how, then, shall we account for the fact that there are events in Christ's ministration, still future, which were typified by especial ceremonies under the former dispensation? Easily enough. Paul has furnished us a key to this subject, and not to use it, is to inexcusably expose ourselves to confusion and error. He makes two plain and distinct statements, which set the matter in its true light. One of them occurs in Hebrews, and reads as follows: "For the law, having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect." Heb. x, 1. Paul shows by this language that the system of types and shadows is to be taken together as a whole. "The law," he says, as a whole, "having a shadow of good things to come." Hence we cannot take each individual type and consider it as something complete and distinct in itself, and trace it down till we reach the particular event in this dispensation which it typifies. But the law as a system, that whole dispensation with its typical work, foreshadowed the good things of the gospel. The dividing line then must come between the dispensations. No part of the former dispensation can lap over into this. None of the shadows which went to make up that system, can continue when that dispensation has given place to the new. The shadows there cease be-

cause the particular economy which gave them existence there closed; but in their appropriate places in this dispensation will be found the antitypes of all those shadows which composed that system, by which this, taken collectively, was foreshadowed.

The other statement referred to is Col. ii, 16, 17; "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." It is the little word, of, which is important in this testimony for our present purpose, "The body is *of* Christ;" that is to say, the body or antitype of all these ceremonies is connected with the work of Christ, and will be found in something pertaining to his ministration. As in the text first quoted, Paul shows that it was the law system taken as a whole, that contained the shadow, he here shows that it is the ministration of Christ, taken as a whole, that contains the substance. And when the ministration of Christ commences, the typical dispensation has given place to the real, the shadow to the substance, and all things pertaining to the former must cease, or we should have two ministrations going on at the same time; which would be inadmissible.

The illustration often used on this subject, is, that the shadow of a tree can be traced up to the tree itself. And this illustration is a good one; for we must remember that every branch, or each individual ceremony was not a separate and independent shadow of itself, to be traced to a distinct tree in this dispensation; but that that dispensation as a whole was the shadow, and this as a whole the tree which cast it; and the shadow did reach down without interruption to the in-

troduction of this dispensation, where the tree commenced. It is here that Eld. P. falls into Fallacy No. 5, by making the types of that dispensation, instead of component parts of one great whole, separate and independent types of themselves.

But was not the Sabbath also a component part of that typical whole? By no means. And here Eld. P. is guilty of another Fallacy, No. 6, by making the weekly Sabbath the same in nature, and a part of the same system, as the typical sabbaths of the Jews. The Sabbath was instituted, as we shall presently show, before ever the typical dispensation was ordained; it was never incorporated into that dispensation in such a manner as to be dependent on it for existence; and its supposed antitype, the glorious seventh thousand years, is no part of the antitypical ministration of Christ. There is nothing in the antitypical work of the Saviour of which the weekly Sabbath can be shown to be typical; hence it does not belong to that class of feasts and sabbaths, the body of which is "of" Christ. If therefore the Sabbath is a type, it stands out by itself, independent of everything else, and must consequently exist till its direct antitype is reached. Thus Eld. P. will find the laboring oar on this point still in his own hands. He will find the burden of proof resting down more heavily than ever upon his shoulders. We would that he had been prudent enough to avoid such a yoke which no man is able to bear; but we would remind him that he may yet cast it off by turning again to the truth; for the truth is long-suffering, and will still receive those who seek her presence, notwithstanding they may have often unaccountably shut their eyes to her gracious light.

Preble.—"ORIGIN OF THE SABBATH. If my position

be right in regard to the *design* of the Sabbath; that is, that it was a 'sign' to 'the children of Israel throughout their generations;' then the *origin* of the Sabbath has nothing to do with the particular point now under consideration, and we need not multiply words about the question whether it had its origin at the creation, or at the time of the Israelites' coming out of Egypt. For be it remembered, that my point is this: that the seventh-day Sabbath being a sign, or type, it was only to be observed by a people under types and shadows; and the Gentiles not being a typical people, they are not required to keep the typical Sabbath; although it is their duty, as the duty of all Christians, to keep a Sabbath, as I have already stated. Before I close I intend fully to prove that the day for us to observe is 'the first day of the week.'"

REPLY.—In relation to the Sabbath as a sign, also of the difference between a sign and a type, we have already spoken. A word now in reference to its origin. The question of the origin of the Sabbath presents perhaps a more formidable objection to Eld. P.'s position, than any other portion of the subject. We can all see therefore how fortunate it would be for him, could he by any means avoid meeting the issue here. He attempts this in a very novel and summary way, and one which would be vastly convenient, if it was only lawful. If the Sabbath be a sign or type, he says, here again confounding the word sign with type, then no matter about its origin. But hold, friend P.; for the origin of the Sabbath is the *very point* that determines whether the Sabbath is a type or not; and to ignore this, is begging the whole question. If the Sabbath originated with types, and rests on the same basis, and belongs to the same system with them, then it is a type, the controversy is ended, and we will never more take up our pen to argue its obligation upon gospel Christians. But if the Sabbath originated far back of

all types and shadows, if it rests on a different basis altogether, and is infinitely higher in its nature, and sustains a universal relation to all the inhabitants of this earth, then verily it is not a type, and no man can rightfully attempt to degrade it into a typical office. In examining the claims of any institution, its origin is the first, if not the main, question to be considered. We are the more surprised, therefore, that so thorough a controversialist as Eld. P., in efforts apparently so sincere to spread light on the Sabbath question, should so entirely pass by this division of the subject.

When, then, and how, did the Sabbath originate? We answer, It originated in Paradise, before man had fallen, and before sin had entered into the world. It will be unnecessary to "multiply words" to prove this point. We need do scarcely more than quote the plain language of the inspired record. In the first chapter of Genesis, we have a plain, unvarnished narrative of the events of the first six days of time. It tells what was done on each successive day. The narrative goes right on, in the following chapter, in the same spirit, and same construction, and gives the events of the seventh day. Can we then on any ground claim that what is said of the seventh day is not a record of what then took place on that day, but of what was done to it 2500 years afterward in the days of Moses? The idea is unnatural, uncalled for, unreasonable, preposterous. Yet this is the only loop-hole of escape from the position that the Sabbath was instituted in Paradise. Set this down, then, as an indisputable fact, that what is said of the seventh day in Gen. ii, is a record of what was done on, and to, the seventh day in the beginning, and not at any subsequent period.

And what were those events. First God rested up-

on the day. Sabbath means rest; and any day to be a Sabbath, or rest day, must be a day on which some one has rested. The Sabbath of the Lord must be the day on which he rested. He did rest upon the seventh day. We have no record of his ever resting upon any other day. No other day therefore ever has been, or can be at the present time, the Sabbath of the Lord. But God does more than this to make it a Sabbath for man. He added his blessing. "And God blessed the seventh day." We have no account of his ever blessing any other day. No other day therefore even has been, or can be at the present time, the blessed or holy Sabbath of the Lord. He then sanctified it, that is, set it apart to a holy or sacred use. No other day has ever been thus set apart for man, hence no other day ever has been, or can be at the present time, binding on man, as a divine institution. This blessing and sanctification were placed upon it after the first seventh day had passed. Hence this action had no reference to the day that had passed, but to the seventh days that were to come in the future. And the fact that the day was sanctified or set apart, clothes the institution with a divine command at the very beginning, and sends it forth with all the authority of Jehovah so long as that sanctification shall last.

The fact that the day was sanctified is the record that a command was given for its observance. This is at once apparent when we consider that it is utterly impossible to sanctify or set apart to a religious use, any institution without plainly giving directions or a command how it should be used. See instances in Ex. xix, 12, 23; Josh. xx, 7; Joel i, 14; ii. 15; 2 Kings x, 20, 21; Zeph. i, 7, margin. And when God in giving his law on Sinai, spoke of his rest-day, he de-

clared it to be the Sabbath day at the time it was blessed of God. "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." But it was blessed in the very beginning as we have seen, and hence was the Sabbath day at that time. We have no record that the blessing has ever been removed, or the sanctification taken off; hence it is the blessed and sanctified rest-day of Jehovah still.

We are now prepared to consider the bearing of this argument upon the question whether or not the Sabbath is a type. All types point forward to something connected with the work of redemption. They have no other design than this. Hence no type would ever have been introduced had not man fallen and needed a redemption. They all originate therefore this side of the fall. But the Sabbath was instituted before the fall, before man needed redemption, and before anything was, or could have been, reasonably, given to foreshadow that work. All the types that were ever instituted had no meaning except as they recognized the work of Christ in redemption; but the seventh-day Sabbath was from creation a holy day, and all the facts to which the fourth commandment points would have been just as true as they are now if Christ had never died. While the types, among which were the typical sabbaths of the Jews, recognized man's guilt, and signified God's willingness to save, the seventh-day Sabbath would have occupied the same place it now occupies, and ever has occupied, even if man had never sinned. The typical sabbaths were shadows of things to come; the seventh-day Sabbath was and is a memorial of things past. The two classes of sabbaths point in opposite directions, and hence cannot be classed together. The one pointed forward to redemption; the

other points back to creation: "*For* in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; *wherefore* the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." The seventh-day Sabbath therefore is not a type, if reason and revelation may decide this question. Had Eld. P. more carefully considered this point, we think he would have saved himself from the assumption that the Sabbath is a type, and of so coolly passing by, on that assumption, the question of its origin as having no bearing on the subject.

We request the reader to give special attention to the point now under consideration. Go back to the beginning. Behold Adam and Eve, in innocence and holiness in the garden of Eden. Behold God giving to them as the parents and representatives of the whole human family, his holy Sabbath, the memorial of his own great work, designed to ever keep in the mind of man his own origin, the knowledge of the true God, and the allegiance due from man to him. And who shall tell us which one of the descendants of Adam might first override this great memorial, and transgress this divine command? Are not all equally interested in the events of creation? Do not all the world need a memorial of the true God? Do they not all need the same great bulwark against atheism and idolatry?

There was another holy institution given to man at the same time with the Sabbath, the institution of marriage. It is well that this guardian institution of our domestic peace should be sacredly cherished; but why should the golden link that binds us to our Maker be trampled in the dust? We cannot better close these brief allusions to the origin of the Sabbath than

with the following impressive language of J. W. MORRISON: "Why is there now such bitter opposition to an institution that was once the delight of both God and man? Why do men hate with such perfect hatred what Jehovah made, and blessed, and sanctified, before sin had entered into the world? Why should *this* daughter of Innocence be spurned from every door, and loaded with the damning reproach of Judaism, while her twin sister, Marriage, sucks the breasts and is dandled upon the knees of Orthodoxy?"

Preble.—"MINISTRATION OF DEATH WRITTEN AND ENGRAVEN IN STONES"—"DONE AWAY."—Can there be any law without a penalty? If, then, the penalty be changed, then is the law abrogated, or '*done away.*' But those who contend for the seventh-day Sabbath, are obliged to take the position, that the moral law, as contained in the decalogue, or 'ten commandments,' which was written on tables of stone, is *now* in full force.

"Death was the penalty for violating the law of the Sabbath. As we read:

"Six days may work be done, but in the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord; whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death.' Ex. xxxi, 15. And again: 'Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day.' Ex. xxxv, 2, 3.

"Is this penalty now in force? No one dare say it is. If they do, then let *them go without FIRE!* (?) on the Sabbath, or else let *them be put to 'DEATH'* on Sunday, the first day of the week! If, then, the penalty is '*done away,*' or abrogated, then the law is also '*done away,*' or abrogated, which required the penalty. But those who contend for observing the Sabbath according to 'the letter' of the law, advocate '*death,*' even until now. If they ask, why? I answer, '*The letter*

killeth. Shall we advocate 'life?' or 'death?' Life, certainly, says the advocate for the seventh-day Sabbath. Then be consistent, and yield to the 'able ministers of the New Testament,' and follow the *spirit*, and not the *letter*; 'for the letter *killeth*, but the spirit *giveth life*,' as the apostle says: 'God hath made us *able ministers* of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter *killeth*, but the spirit *giveth life*. But if the ministration of death, *written and engraven in stones*, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is *done away* was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious.' 2 Cor. iii, 6-11.

"What distraction and '*division*' those are guilty of who 'preach another gospel,' as those certainly do who advocate the following of the '*letter*' as '*written and engraven on stones*,' instead of advocating the following of the '*spirit*.' 'For if that which is *done away* was glorious, much more that which *remaineth is glorious*. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech,' (2 Cor. iii, 11, 12,) and say with the apostle:

"'But there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again. If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.' Gal. i, 7, 9.

"And why will not men take heed, and follow the '*spirit*' instead of the '*letter*?' For if any one follow the '*letter*,' he will surely '*be accursed*,' for the '*LETTER KILLETH*!' And the apostle would even denounce 'an angel from heaven' with a curse, if he should 'preach another gospel!' My 'great plainness of

speech' must be continued so as to say: 'Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences *contrary to the doctrine* which ye have learned, and avoid them.' Rom. xvi, 17.

"Did the apostle ever advocate the '*doctrine*' of the seventh-day Sabbath? Never. Then those who do advocate it, do so '*contrary to the doctrine*' which the apostle preached; and, therefore, if man, or 'an angel from heaven,' 'cause divisions' contrary to the apostle's '*doctrine*,' let them 'be accursed!' Thus saith the Scriptures."

REPLY.—The law and the ministration of the law, are two things. Paul, in 2 Cor. iii, is simply contrasting the two ministrations, the former, or Mosaic, and the present, or ministration of the Spirit. And a change of ministration in no wise affects the existence of the law. The fact, therefore, that we are now living under the ministration of the Spirit, has no bearing on the question of the abolition or doing away of the law, further than this: It shows that some law must be still in existence. Without a law there can be no ministration. If there is a ministration, there must be something to be ministered. What law it is of which we now have the ministration of the Spirit, we shall presently show.

"Can there be any law without a penalty?" asks Eld. P., with as much apparent triumph as though that had something to do with the subject. We advocate no law that has no penalty. Death ever was and is the penalty of the violation of the law of God. And hence, we do well to decide carefully, lest by rejecting the Sabbath, we trample upon a portion of that law, and thus incur its penalty; for the apostle James, speaking of the ten commandments, says, that he who offends in one point is guilty of all.

Elder P. is careful to single out the Sabbath com-

mandment, as one to which the penalty of death was formerly attached. This seems to be a peculiarity with the opponents of the Sabbath. We wish it had not so much the appearance of a design to mislead the uninformed. Why do they pass over the other commandments of the decalogue? for these all had the penalty of death attached to them equally with the Sabbath. Why endeavor to raise an argument against the Sabbath, on account of its penalty, as though that penalty was peculiar to the Sabbath, while at the same time it was common to all the other commandments? For proof that the penalty of death was attached to all the rest of the decalogue, see the following scriptures:—Deut. xiii, 6-10; Lev. xxiv, 11-14; Deut. xxi, 18-21; Ex. xxi, 12; Deut. xxii, 24; Josh. vii, 10-25. Yet Elder P. has every commandment, except the fourth, binding in this dispensation without the death penalty. We might turn upon him his own question, "Can there be any law without a penalty?" How does he have these commandments still binding? When he will tell us, we will tell him how we have the Sabbath commandment still in force; for they all rest upon exactly the same basis.

A word now in relation to the penalty, though it is not essential to a refutation of his argument. The penalty of death, to be inflicted by the magistrate under the former dispensation, was attached to the ten commandments as a part of the *civil* code of the Hebrew nation. The ten commandments were first proclaimed by the voice of God from Sinai, engraved with his own finger on tables of stone, and deposited in the ark in the most holy place of the sanctuary. As such, they constituted a distinct law. Ex. xxiv, 12; Deut. xxxiii, 2. They were especially "*God's law*," which all man-

kind, as subject to the government of God, were bound to obey, and for a violation of which they were answerable at his bar alone. These commands were also incorporated into the civil code of the Jews; and as such, penalties were attached to be inflicted by the magistrate. This penalty doubtless represented the final retribution of the ungodly. When the Jewish polity ceased, these civil penalties, as a part thereof, also ceased. But the real penalty of the law, to be inflicted by the great Lawgiver, has not been set aside. When a man, under the former dispensation, broke the Sabbath, or any other commandment, and was stoned for it, he was punished as an offender against the national constitution, into which these laws were, for the time being, incorporated. But this must not be confounded with the penalty of the law, as it existed independent of that Jewish system. To illustrate: The crime of murder is in some States, at the present time, punishable with death, according to the civil law; but though the criminal may suffer the penalty of this law, he is still answerable for the crime of murder at the bar of God.

There are three gross absurdities which attach themselves to this position of our opponents, that death under the old dispensation was the full penalty of the law of God. 1. It makes God commit into the hands of man, the full penalty of his law, or the punishment of offences committed against himself! 2. When a person was stoned, he paid the penalty of the law, and in the resurrection, he will be raised, of course, to salvation, for the law has no more claims upon him, he having paid the penalty. 3. If a person, under that dispensation, could elude the vigilance of the laws, and, though he had committed crime, was not detected, in the resur-

rection he also will be raised to salvation; for no law will be found to demand his punishment. And thus the sinner might offend against God, and yet, if he could escape the short-sighted and uncertain vigilance of man, go free! Was God ever thus slack and loose in his system of government? Let those alone believe it, whose position compels them to that absurdity. Here we detect Fallacy No. 7, in Eld. P.'s reasoning, as he confounds the penalty attached to the commandments as a part of the civil code of the Jews, with the penalty which will be inflicted on their violation, as the moral law of God.

But Eld. P., like all other Anti-Sabbatarians, finds it impossible to pass over this subject without saying something about fires. It is very easy to throw out an objection, and leave it to work its own confusion in the mind of the reader, without attempting to show its direct bearing upon the subject. We shall only reply to this hint thus thrown out respecting the prohibition of fires upon the Sabbath, that it was simply a local and temporary statute. It was not even binding on the Jews after they entered the promised land, but only while they sojourned in the wilderness. Much less have we anything to do with it. See *History of the Sabbath*, pp. 67-71.

Eld. P. continues: "If any one follow the letter he will surely 'be accursed,' for the 'LETTER KILLETH.'" According to his vocabulary, the "letter" is the law with the Sabbath in it, and the "spirit" is the law with the Sabbath left out, or with Sunday in its place. For the law that Eld. P. now has binding, is exactly identical with the decalogue of the Old Testament, except that another day has absorbed the sacredness and clothed itself with the obligations of the Sabbath of

the fourth commandment. Hence it is the Sabbath that kills, the Sabbath is the "curse," the Sabbath is the offending member in the old law. This must be so; for if the new is superior to the old, its superiority must consist in those points wherein it differs from the old; and the old must also be faulty in just those particulars; but all the difference there is, as we have seen, is, that the seventh day of the old is set aside, and the first day put in its place. Hence, we repeat, and let it be continually borne in mind, that the Sabbath alone is the object of all the denunciations bestowed upon the law of God. Let the reader bear in mind, while reading the remarks of Eld. P. from this time on, that it is the Sabbath that kills, and it is the Sabbath that is the curse. "If any one follow the letter," says he, "he will surely be accursed." It is now time to refer the reader back to Way-mark No. 2, in which he argued that distinction of days was a matter of perfect indifference; but now it seems it has come to be quite a serious matter; for thereby we become subject to death, and destined to be accursed. And this we will set down as Way-mark No. 3. Paul's language was quoted: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," and, "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord." Nevertheless, it now seems that though the day is regarded to the Lord, he who does it will be accursed and subject to death. Was Paul willing that every man should be persuaded in his own mind whether to be accursed or not? Was he thus indifferent to the welfare of his readers? And has Eld. P. so soon forgotten his own position?

He continues, "Did the apostle ever advocate the doctrine of the seventh-day Sabbath? Never. Then those who do advocate it, do so contrary to the doc-

trine which the apostle preached." Eld. P. has announced his purpose to prove that the first day of the week should now be observed. And to anticipate a little, we will ask, Did the apostle ever advocate the doctrine of the first-day Sabbath? Never. Then they who do advocate it, do so "contrary to the doctrine" which the apostle preached; and let such "be accused." Thus saith Eld. P.'s own version of the Scriptures.

Preble.—"MIDDLE WALL OF PARTITION BROKEN DOWN!—Are Christians, under the gospel dispensation, required to go back to the law by which the 'commonwealth of Israel' were once to be governed? Or are they to come forward; and thus, by reason of Christ, who is our peace,' be 'made both one?' Or, in other words, was 'the middle wall of partition' 'broken down,' that the Gentiles might go in where the Jews had been! (?) or were the Jews to come out where the Gentiles were? May all give audience, and let the apostle Paul once more speak:

"Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world; but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the house-

hold of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. ii, 11-22.

"Yes! thank the Lord Jesus, 'we are builded together for an habitation of God THROUGH THE SPIRIT,' (verse 22,) and not through the 'letter,' or the law. For 'the law worketh wrath,' or 'death,' but the 'Spirit' worketh 'peace,' or 'life.' And thus we greatly rejoice that Christ Jesus hath 'abolished' in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so MAKING PEACE.' Eph. ii, 15.

"In my next I promise to treat upon the subject of the 'Moral Law!'"

REPLY.—In the above extract Eld. P. has so fully answered his own argument, that but very little is left for us to do. To his somewhat ludicrous question, "Was the middle wall of partition broken down that the Gentiles might go in where the Jews had been! (?) or were the Jews to come out where the Gentiles were?" a sufficient reply is found in the scripture he has quoted from Eph. ii, 11-22. Eld. P. would evidently design to convey the impression, however, that the partition wall was broken down that the Jews might come out where the Gentiles were! If so, let us see what they came to. What condition were the Gentiles in, and what blessings and promises did they inherit, when the Jews were permitted, according to this new view, to come out and be partakers with them? The first chapter of Romans describes their condition in all its beauty! It represents them as guilty of every abominable thing that the heart of man, aided by the inspiration of the Devil, could conceive. And the very scripture which Eld. P. has quoted declares them to be

without Christ, without hope, and without God in the world. Was the middle wall of partition broken down that the Jews might come out and be partakers with them in these things, that they also might have no hope, and might be without God in the world? Glorious object (!) But our limits forbid us to dwell upon it further. The truth is, the apostle represents just the reverse of this. We have "given audience" with unfeigned delight to the apostle's words; and Eld. P.'s italics are no less gratifying. They are exactly the same as we should have used, were we given to italicizing. The apostle sets the matter forth in this clear light: The Gentiles were without Christ, and were *aliens from the commonwealth of Israel*, and strangers from the covenants of promise; they were *afar off*; but the middle wall of partition that kept them far off, and separated them from the commonwealth of Israel, was broken down, and hence, (what? the Jews were removed afar off to be with the Gentiles? No; but) the Gentiles were "made nigh" by the blood of Christ; they were through Christ admitted into the commonwealth of Israel, so that Paul could say to such of them as turned to Christ, "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but *fellow citizens* with the saints, and of the household of God." And why was the way laid open to the Gentiles to join themselves to the commonwealth of Israel? Because Israel had been made the possessors of all the treasures of truth, and the promises of salvation. "To them," says Paul, Rom. ix, 4, pertained "the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants." Both the covenants, the old and the new, were made with Israel. Such a thing as a covenant with the Gentiles is never heard of in all the Bible; and the only way a Gentile can become a par-

taker in the new covenant, is to be made a member of the "commonwealth of Israel." The apostle goes on to say, that to them also pertain the service of God, and the promises. All the promises of future blessedness are ours only as we become "fellow citizens with the saints;" and the Saviour declares that salvation itself is of the Jews; John iv, 22; and if we would become heirs of the promises, or according to the promise, we must be Christ's and so Abraham's seed. Gal. iii, 29.

The quotation Eld. P. has given us from Eph. ii, 11-22, is so much to our purpose that we request the reader to give it a second perusal. In connection with it, read also verse 6 of chapter iii, where Paul, in speaking of the mystery of the gospel, says, "That the *Gentiles* should be *fellow-heirs*, and of the same *body*, and *partakers of his promise*, in Christ by the gospel."

Paul further illustrates this subject by his representation of the tame and wild olive trees, in Rom. xi. The tame olive tree represents the house of Israel; the wild olive tree the Gentiles. Through unbelief, or their rejection of Christ, some of the members of the household of Israel, or branches of the tame olive, were broken off; and the Gentiles were simply grafted in to supply their place. Did the Gentiles thus become the root, trunk and branches of a new tree? No; but simply branches of the same old olive tree, or members of the commonwealth of Israel.

Many speak and act as though all with which the Jews had ever anything to do, was only worthy of the bitterest contempt. But they have reason rather to thank God that such a people as the Jews ever lived, chosen at first because found faithful when all others had turned to idolatry, to preserve a knowledge of the

living God, and of his truth in the earth, and to be the instruments through which the blessings of the gospel should be bestowed upon us. Among the advantages which we receive through them, Paul enumerates also "the giving of the law." Through them the moral law is transmitted to us, and we therewith receive the Sabbath—not the Sabbath of the Jews, but of Him who is the God of the Gentiles also.

Preble.—"THE MORAL LAW.—What shall we understand by the term 'moral law?' That 'law of God which prescribes the moral and social duties, and prohibits the transgression of them.' We shall all agree, then, that the *moral law* is distinct or separate from the *ceremonial* or *ritual law*. Then the question arises, 'Is the old moral law, as contained in the Old Testament, now in force, or is it dead?' That law is 'dead,' or, in other words, it is 'fulfilled,' as I shall presently show. But as it is my only object, at this time, to speak of the moral law as bearing upon the seventh-day Sabbath, and as the law which enjoins the observance of this day is embraced in the fourth commandment, I will first prove that the law is abrogated, or 'dead,' as was alluded to in my last; from the fact that the *penalty* is 'done away,' and of course the law must also be 'done away' which enforced the penalty, which penalty was 'death,' for death was the penalty for the violation of the Sabbath surely. (See Ex. xxxi, 15; xxxv, 2, 3.)

"But, says the objector, is there no law then now in force which relates to the moral and social duties of man with man, and also our duty to God? Certainly, there is the 'MORAL LAW OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; but that of the Old is 'done away,' as will more clearly appear as we proceed. In Rom. iii, 20-22, we read:

"Therefore, by the *deeds of the law* there shall no *flesh* be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But *now* the righteousness of God *without the law* is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God

which is *by faith* of Jesus Christ unto *all* and upon *all* them that *believe*; for there is *no difference*.'

"What law is this here spoken of by the apostle? Not the *ceremonial* or *ritual*, but the *moral law*. Then let us start fairly, and always bear in mind that '*by the deeds*' or works '*of the law* there shall no' person living be justified in God's sight. We then inquire with the apostle, 'Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay; but by the *law of faith*. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified *by faith without* the deeds of the *law*. Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also; seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith. Do we then *make void* the law through faith? *God forbid*; yea, we *establish the law*.' Rom. iii, 27-31.

"But let us remember that we do not 'establish the law' by keeping the old law of works, 'but by the' new 'law of FAITH.' If we observe the old law of works, 'faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect.' 'For the promise, that he should be the *heir of the world*, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, *through the law*, but through the *righteousness of faith*. For if they which are of the *law* be *heirs*, *faith* is made *void*, and the *promise* made of none effect; because the *law* worketh *wrath*; for where no law is, there is no transgression. Therefore it is of *faith*, that it might be by *grace*, to the end the promise might be *sure to all the seed*; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all.' Rom. iv, 13-16. Thus we see, that the promise made to Abraham, that he should be '*the heir of the world*,' (Greek, *kosmos*—habitable globe,) was not through the works of the law, 'but through the righteousness of faith.' 'Therefore, it is of *faith*, that it might be of *grace*; to the end the *promise* might be *sure to all the seed*.' Amen.

"For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of *grace*, but of *debt*. But to him that worketh not, but

believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, *his faith is counted for righteousness.*' Rom. iv, 3-5. 'For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid.' Rom. vi, 14, 15. 'For until the law, sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.' 'Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, *grace did much more abound*; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might *grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life* BY JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD.' Rom. v, 13, 14, 20, 21. 'Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him that is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.' Rom. vii, 4-6.

"Here we reach a point of much interest. Two things in this last quotation require special attention. And first, here we prove positively that the law here spoken of is not the ceremonial, but the 'moral law'; for we see by referring to verse 3, of this same chapter, that the law referred to is that which speaks of 'adultery,' and this sin is the one mentioned in the 'seventh commandment' of the decalogue; and this is what gives us the positive proof that the 'moral law' is the one referred to. And second, we also prove positively, that this moral law is DEAD, as we find in the 6th verse of the last quotation: 'But now we are delivered from the law, THAT BEING DEAD wherein we were held; that we should serve in NEWNESS OF SPIRIT, and not in the oldness of the LETTER.' Amen and amen.

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh,

but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.' Rom. viii, 1-4. 'What shall we say then? that the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith; but Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law; for they stumbled at that stumbling-stone.' Rom. ix, 30-32.

"Yes, 'they stumbled at that stumbling-stone!' Would to God the stumbling had all been confined to the old Jews! But, alas! too many are still stumbling in the same way, and for the same cause! They love the old law of works better than the new 'law of faith!' And it appears to me that the language of the apostle to the Hebrews will most strikingly apply to such:

"He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under-foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" Heb. x, 28, 29.

"But, alas! alas! how many are still to be justified by the 'law of works,' instead of the 'law of faith,' through our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a fearful thing for men to trample 'under-foot the Son of God!' as they verily do, who turn aside from his 'law of faith,' the law of the 'Spirit,' the law of 'GRACE!' to follow the old law of works! In the fourth verse I have above quoted from Rom. viii, the apostle says: 'The righteousness of the law' is 'FULFILLED in us, who walk not after the flesh,' or the law, 'but after the SPIRIT.' Amen."

REPLY.—We were at first disposed to regret the necessity of taking up the time of the reader with such lengthy, and seemingly uncalled-for, quotations and throwing together of scripture, as Eld. P. has given us above, as the only object, or, perhaps, we should rather say, tendency, of their quotation, can be nothing less than to worry the reader into complete bewilderment, on this subject. In another point of view, however, we do not regret it; as they furnish a fair illustration of the fact, that it is impossible for him to quote any large amount of consecutive scripture on the subject of the Sabbath and law, without running against testimony that directly contradicts his own position.

We are gratified to find him admitting "that the moral law is distinct or separate from the ceremonial or ritual." In this he certainly bears away the palm for honesty, over those who would endeavor to create confusion on a point so plain, and confound objects so evidently and essentially distinct. We are no less gratified with his subsequent admission that this moral law is the decalogue or ten commandments. Nor is our gratification lessened when he admits that the seventh-day Sabbath is a part of that law. Here, then, we understand him. The moral law, in distinction from the ceremonial, is the ten commandments, and the Sabbath is a part of that law. But the reader will remember that Eld. P.'s first and greatest reason for giving up the Sabbath, was because it was a type. And, therefore, we now inquire, Does the moral law, "which prescribes the moral and social duties," deal with types? Does it incorporate into itself that which is shadowy and transitory? Do moral obligations differ in different ages? Verily not. Thus his reasoning on the

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

moral law completely nullifies his argument on the Sabbath as a type.

But this moral law, he says, is dead, or, "in other words, it is fulfilled." He should have remembered that a moral law is not abolished by being fulfilled. A moral law can be fulfilled only by rendering perfect obedience thereto. This is the very meaning, and, we submit, the *only* meaning that the word fulfill can have as applied to a moral law. If it is still contended that fulfill means to abolish, we refer him to Gal. vi, 2:—"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so *fulfill* the law of Christ." Then if God's law is fulfilled and abolished, and Christ's law is also fulfilled and abolished, pray tell us what there is left? Thus in their zeal to get rid of the Sabbath, men will adopt a course of reasoning which would prove the abrogation of all law! Would it not be better to accept of this institution which God has ever spoken of as his blessed and holy rest-day, which the holy men of the Bible have ever regarded with unfeigned delight, and which is ever represented as made for man, as an institution made to supply his want, and to be one of his greatest blessings; would it not be better, we say, to receive and observe this institution, than to fall into all the inconsistencies which opposition to it uniformly involves, and thus foster skepticism, and strengthen the sinner in his rebellion against the government of Heaven.

Eld. P.'s reasoning that the law is abolished, because the penalty of death is not now inflicted, has been sufficiently refuted already. His "moral law of the New Testament," we shall call for in due time. We venture to predict that it will puzzle him somewhat to find it. He goes on to show that the law is abolished, because Paul says, in Rom. iii, 20, &c., that "by the deeds of

the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight." But let it be particularly noticed, that Paul does not say that the law cannot under any circumstances justify a person, but only that the circumstances in which the world is now, are such that none can be justified by the law in the sight of God. And what are those circumstances? He fully states them in the verse before. Verse 19: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. *Therefore*, by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." Two facts are brought out by this testimony, which should be held in continual remembrance: they are, first, that the moral law is binding not upon the Jews only, but upon "all the world;" and every mouth is stopped, and all the world becomes guilty by its transgression; and, second, that *therefore* no flesh can be justified by it. Here it is as plain as language can make it. The word, *therefore*, denotes a conclusion drawn from some preceding facts. The facts are that all the world have transgressed the law, and become guilty. Therefore they cannot be justified by the law: for the law cannot justify its transgressors; yet if we understand Eld. P., he finds fault with the law, and considers it an evidence that it is "done away," because it will not justify the guilty! A law that would justify its own violation! What would such a law be good for? Think of it. It would nullify itself, and be only an evidence of supreme foolishness on the part of the lawgiver. Amid all the weaknesses and short sightedness of human counsels, they have never yet been marked by any such folly as this; and we can only add, May the Lord have mercy on those who will

not receive his law, because it is *not* stamped with imperfection far exceeding anything that ever yet attached to human enactments!

But will Eld. P.'s moral law of the New Testament justify the transgressor? If it will, for what purpose has Christ shed his blood? And if it will not, why does he object on that ground to the moral law of the Old Testament?

Great stress is laid on the expression, "Justified by faith, *without* the deeds of the law." Rom. iii, 28. We would ask those who so confidently use this to prove the law abolished, Does the expression, "*without* the deeds of the law," signify that a person can be justified while living in violation of the duties enjoined in the moral law? If it does not, then we are in no wise released from the law by that expression; and if it does, then do you make Christ the minister of sin, and grant the wicked a license for his wickedness.

Should the inquiry be raised how we would apply Paul's language, the answer is not difficult: The law requiring perfect obedience, we, having transgressed it, can never by our future obedience make up for our past transgressions; for no man can ever render more than perfect obedience, and perfect obedience only meets the present requirements of the law. Hence, in spite of all that we can do, our past transgressions stand against us, and the law demanding the death of the transgressor, or, in other words, the wages of sin being death, we are irrecoverably lost, unless we lay hold on the sacrifice of the Saviour, and avail ourselves of his freely-offered righteousness to supply our past lack. 1 Cor. i, 30. Doing this, our past offences are forgiven, and we are accounted righteous, that is, as though we had always been obedient. This is the rela-

REPLY.—We were at first disposed to regret the necessity of taking up the time of the reader with such lengthy, and seemingly uncalled-for, quotations and throwing together of scripture, as Eld. P. has given us above, as the only object, or, perhaps, we should rather say, tendency, of their quotation, can be nothing less than to worry the reader into complete bewilderment, on this subject. In another point of view, however, we do not regret it; as they furnish a fair illustration of the fact, that it is impossible for him to quote any large amount of consecutive scripture on the subject of the Sabbath and law, without running against testimony that directly contradicts his own position.

We are gratified to find him admitting "that the moral law is distinct or separate from the ceremonial or ritual." In this he certainly bears away the palm for honesty, over those who would endeavor to create confusion on a point so plain, and confound objects so evidently and essentially distinct. We are no less gratified with his subsequent admission that this moral law is the decalogue or ten commandments. Nor is our gratification lessened when he admits that the seventh-day Sabbath is a part of that law. Here, then, we understand him. The moral law, in distinction from the ceremonial, is the ten commandments, and the Sabbath is a part of that law. But the reader will remember that Eld. P.'s first and greatest reason for giving up the Sabbath, was because it was a type. And, therefore, we now inquire, Does the moral law, "which prescribes the moral and social duties," deal with types? Does it incorporate into itself that which is shadowy and transitory? Do moral obligations differ in different ages? Verily not. Thus his reasoning on the

ADVENTIST

HERITAGE CENTER
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

moral law completely nullifies his argument on the Sabbath as a type.

But this moral law, he says, is dead, or, "in other words, it is fulfilled." He should have remembered that a moral law is not abolished by being fulfilled. A moral law can be fulfilled only by rendering perfect obedience thereto. This is the very meaning, and, we submit, the *only* meaning that the word fulfill can have as applied to a moral law. If it is still contended that fulfill means to abolish, we refer him to Gal. vi, 2:—"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." Then if God's law is fulfilled and abolished, and Christ's law is also fulfilled and abolished, pray tell us what there is left? Thus in their zeal to get rid of the Sabbath, men will adopt a course of reasoning which would prove the abrogation of all law! Would it not be better to accept of this institution which God has ever spoken of as his blessed and holy rest-day, which the holy men of the Bible have ever regarded with unfeigned delight, and which is ever represented as made for man, as an institution made to supply his want, and to be one of his greatest blessings; would it not be better, we say, to receive and observe this institution, than to fall into all the inconsistencies which opposition to it uniformly involves, and thus foster skepticism, and strengthen the sinner in his rebellion against the government of Heaven.

Eld. P.'s reasoning that the law is abolished, because the penalty of death is not now inflicted, has been sufficiently refuted already. His "moral law of the New Testament," we shall call for in due time. We venture to predict that it will puzzle him somewhat to find it. He goes on to show that the law is abolished, because Paul says, in Rom. iii, 20, &c., that "by the deeds of

the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight." But let it be particularly noticed, that Paul does not say that the law cannot under any circumstances justify a person, but only that the circumstances in which the world is now, are such that none can be justified by the law in the sight of God. And what are those circumstances? He fully states them in the verse before. Verse 19: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. *Therefore*, by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." Two facts are brought out by this testimony, which should be held in continual remembrance: they are, first, that the moral law is binding not upon the Jews only, but upon "all the world;" and every mouth is stopped, and all the world becomes guilty by its transgression; and, second, that *therefore* no flesh can be justified by it. Here it is as plain as language can make it. The word, therefore, denotes a conclusion drawn from some preceding facts. The facts are that all the world have transgressed the law, and become guilty. Therefore they cannot be justified by the law; for the law cannot justify its transgressors; yet if we understand Eld. P., he finds fault with the law, and considers it an evidence that it is "done away," because it will not justify the guilty! A law that would justify its own violation! What would such a law be good for? Think of it. It would nullify itself, and be only an evidence of supreme foolishness on the part of the lawgiver. Amid all the weaknesses and short sightedness of human counsels, they have never yet been marked by any such folly as this; and we can only add, May the Lord have mercy on those who will

not receive his law, because it is *not* stamped with imperfection far exceeding anything that ever yet attached to human enactments!

But will Eld. P.'s moral law of the New Testament justify the transgressor? If it will, for what purpose has Christ shed his blood? And if it will not, why does he object on that ground to the moral law of the Old Testament?

Great stress is laid on the expression, "Justified by faith, *without* the deeds of the law." Rom. iii, 28. We would ask those who so confidently use this to prove the law abolished, Does the expression, "without the deeds of the law," signify that a person can be justified while living in violation of the duties enjoined in the moral law? If it does not, then we are in no wise released from the law by that expression; and if it does, then do you make Christ the minister of sin, and grant the wicked a license for his wickedness.

Should the inquiry be raised how we would apply Paul's language, the answer is not difficult: The law requiring perfect obedience, we, having transgressed it, can never by our future obedience make up for our past transgressions; for no man can ever render more than perfect obedience, and perfect obedience only meets the present requirements of the law. Hence, in spite of all that we can do, our past transgressions stand against us, and the law demanding the death of the transgressor, or, in other words, the wages of sin being death, we are irrecoverably lost, unless we lay hold on the sacrifice of the Saviour, and avail ourselves of his freely-offered righteousness to supply our past lack. 1 Cor. i, 30. Doing this, our past offences are forgiven, and we are accounted righteous, that is, as though we had always been obedient. This is the rela-

tion that law and gospel sustain to each other. By the law is the knowledge of sin, says the apostle; and by the gospel is brought to view the remedy, or the good news of a way of escape, by justification from our transgressions, through the blood of Christ. Hence, our justification and salvation depend wholly on Christ, and we receive these "without the deeds of the law," that is, the deeds of the law not being taken into account, as we have transgressed the law, and so forfeited all claim to justification on that score. But yet the conditions on which justification through Christ is suspended should not be lost sight of. The first of these is repentance. "Repentance toward God." Acts xx, 21. It is the law of God men have transgressed; hence, repentance has to do with God. Sin, as defined by the apostle, 1 John iii, 4, is the transgression of the law. True repentance is not a lip confession merely, it is also to cease in our lives from doing those things which constitute sin; in other words, to turn to a faithful observance of the law.

Now, putting the definition in place of the term repentance, the proposition can be stated thus: The first condition of justification through Christ, is a faithful observance of the law. Hence, we hear the apostle declaring, Rom. ii, 13, that the doers or observers of the law shall be justified, plainly implying that no others can be entitled to that blessing. And we also understand him when he says in the last verse of chap. iii, "Do we then make void [καταργέω, annul, abrogate, destroy,] the law through faith [or by this system of justification through Christ]? God forbid; yea, we establish the law."

On this point Eld. P. seems to have become somewhat bewildered. He says, "But let us remember that

we do not 'establish the law, by keeping the old law of works, 'but by the' new 'law of faith.' " The question at once arises, Of what law is Paul speaking? What law is it, which is not made void but established through faith? Is it Eld. P.'s "new law of faith?" If so, the text will read like this: "Do we then make void the law of faith through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law of faith!" This, it seems to us, borders hard on nonsense. Nor can we avoid making nonsense of the Apostle's language, except by taking the ground that the law of which he here speaks, is something outside of the New Testament, which he is laboring to show is not made void by the faith of the New Testament. It can apply to nothing else but the moral law of the Old Testament. At any rate, it is the law of which he so fully speaks in the preceding portions of the chapter, which is binding upon all the world, which all have become guilty by transgressing, and by which, therefore, no flesh can be justified.

Eld. P. speaks of the moral law of the Old Testament as "the old law of works." Query: Does not his "moral law of the New Testament" require the same number and the same kind of works? We venture to say that it does; or, in other words, that he has every one of the ten commandments in his new system, not even excepting the Sabbath, only observing it on another day. Then is not his law just as much a law of works as the old? Where is the difference, so far as the works are concerned? And is there either reason or consistency in thus distinguishing between objects which in all their outward particulars are identical, and bestowing opprobrious epithets upon one, while the other is lauded to the heavens?

We now come to Rom. vii, 1-6. Scarcely ever do we

read an exposition of this portion of scripture by an opposer of the law, without being pained at the amount of unnatural effort expended to wrest and pervert this language of the apostle. Somehow it must be made to teach, according to their programme, that the law is abolished, though the apostle designed no such thing, as a few words will suffice to show. Under the figure of marriage, Paul represents the condition of a person before and after conversion. In the illustration are four things, the woman, the law, the first husband, and the second husband to whom she is at liberty to be married after the first husband is dead. In the case illustrated there are also four things: the sinner represented by the woman, the moral law, represented by the law of marriage, something to which the sinner is bound, represented by the first husband, and Christ, represented by the second husband. In the illustration the husband dies, and then the woman is free to marry another. In the case of the sinner, that also which is represented by the first husband dies, and that alone. Now, it will be seen, the whole question is, What constitutes the first husband? Do you say it is the law? Then you violate Paul's illustration; for in that he makes the husband distinct from the law, and it is the husband, not the law, that dies. And again, if you say it is the law that has died, then you make the law the first husband, and represent Paul as teaching the following pitiful absurdity: The sinner is bound by the law to the law as long as the law lives; but when the law is dead, and there is nothing to show or condemn his sin, then he is ready, all reeking with moral pollution, to be received to the bosom of his Saviour!

Again we recur to the question on which the whole

controversy of Rom. vii turns, namely, What constitutes the first husband? We have seen what unpardonable confusion it introduces into Paul's figures to call it the law. What then shall we call it? Answer: That which dies when the sinner is converted. And what is that? It is what St. Paul so often speaks of as the "old man," the "body of sin," the "carnal mind." And this is always represented as being "crucified," "destroyed," and "put off," when the new man is put on. The sixth of Romans is introductory to the seventh. The reader is requested to examine it in this connection. Paul there gives us a discourse on conversion and baptism. He represents the sinner as slain by the law, or dead to sin, the old man crucified, and the body of sin destroyed: then he is ready to be buried with Christ by baptism, and rise to walk in newness of life. See the following scriptures, where the putting off of the old man, and the putting on of the new, or the release from the first husband and the union with the second is described. Eph. iv, 22-24; Col. iii, 9, 10; Rom. vi, 6. Then to illustrate his subject, Paul introduces the figure used in chapter vii, a woman bound by the law to her husband, and not being allowed to marry another till her first husband was dead. Now, mark the conclusion to which he comes through this illustration: Is it that the law is dead? No; but "wherefore, my brethren, *ye*, also, are become *dead* to the law by the body of Christ." Verse 4. "But," says the objector, "do we not read in verse 6, 'But now we are delivered from the law, *that* being dead wherein we were held?' and does not the word, *that*, refer to the law, and show that the law is dead?" By no means. The expression, *that* being dead, does not refer to the law. Turning to the Greek Testament,

we find the word from which that expression comes, to be *ἀποθάνοντες*. Did this word refer to the law, it should be in the genitive singular, the word law, just before it, being in that case and number; but it is in the nominative plural, and therefore refers to the word we: *we* are delivered from the law, *we* being dead to that, &c. The margin of our English version has the same reading, which is a literal rendering of the Greek. But even if we take it as it stands in the text, our opponents cannot make out of it what they claim; for the expression is qualified by the words, "wherein we were held." Wherein were we held while in sin? Not in the law, surely; but in a state of condemnation, or inseparably united to our old man of sin. This must die before we can be free from it. And the expressions, that being dead, or we being dead to that, are synonymous expressions; but the Greek forever settles the question that it cannot refer to the law. Therefore, look at it in whatever light we will, Rom. vii contains no intimation whatever that the law is in any degree relaxed, or we in any wise released from its claims. Rightly understood, there is a beautiful harmony in the illustration that Paul here uses, and the seventh of Romans becomes a strong citadel, not for those who would have the law abolished, but for those who "delight in the law of God after the inward man," and who esteem the "commandment holy, and just and good."

"Amen and amen," exclaims Eld. P., as he reaches the conclusion that the law is "dead." Was it a sense of relief in view of being free from the restraints of law that led to that fervent ejaculation of praise! If so, we are led to fear that the idea of obedience is irksome to him, and that the love through which God de-

signs that all his service shall be prompted, is not found in his heart.

He then quotes Rom. ix, 30-32, which speaks of the Jews' following after righteousness, but not obtaining it, "because they sought it not by faith." This he applies to those who keep the seventh-day Sabbath. How shall we account for this? He certainly must know that no Seventh-day Adventist expects salvation thro' keeping the Sabbath, or any other of the ten commandments; he must know that we rest all our hopes of righteousness and salvation on Christ and him alone; and he must know also, or if not, we can now inform him, that we are not presumptuous or foolish enough to expect justification from our past transgression of the commandments, unless we turn from that transgression, and endeavor for the future to keep those commandments. To claim to be justified from sin, and yet consider ourselves under no obligation to refrain from sin! Who could measure the presumption of such a course, or fathom the degree of insult it is offering to God and his Son, Jesus Christ! As though, because a way has been devised whereby sins can be forgiven, unlimited indulgence is granted us in the future. Eld. P., leave this matter of arguing for, or granting, indulgences, to the "mother of harlots;" it is unbecoming a Protestant and a Christian.

But if we are surprised at his use of Rom. ix, what shall we say to his application of Heb. x, 28, 29? By his quotation of this scripture, he accuses us, because we keep the Sabbath, of treading under foot the Son of God, counting the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and doing despite to the Spirit of grace!! Thus does he make the keeping of the seventh day the most heinous crime that can be committed against the Son

of God! We pause in utter amazement at such an application of scripture. We would here refer the reader again to Waymark No. 2, in which Eld. P. argued that distinction in days was a matter of utter indifference. He represented Paul as teaching that every one might act according to his own persuasion in the matter, whether to observe them or not. It was not long before we came to Waymark No. 3, in which Eld. P. argued that if we did keep the seventh day we should surely be accursed; and now, behold, if we do it, we are treading under foot the Son of God! Did Paul give every man liberty to be persuaded in his own mind whether to tread under foot the Son of God or not?! Set this down as Waymark No. 4.

So then the observance of the Sabbath is to subject us to the sorest of God's punishments. How was it under the former dispensation? Their violation of the Sabbath was one reason why God would not bring the generation of Israel that came out of Egypt, into the promised land. Eze. xx, 15, 16. Its violation by their children in the wilderness, was one of the prime causes of their dispersion from their own land. Verses 23, 24. God promised them that Jerusalem should stand forever if they would keep the Sabbath, but if they would not keep it, a fire should be kindled in the gates thereof, which should not be quenched. Jer. xvii, 20-27. And their continued transgression in this thing was the reason why Jerusalem was at length destroyed. See Neh. xiii, 15-22. Thus great blessings were pronounced upon them if they would keep the Sabbath, the Lord declared that his own honor was involved in their observance of it; Isa. lvi, 2; lviii, 13, 14; and curse after curse followed them on account of its violation. But we pass the dividing line between that

dispensation and this, and lo, according to Eld. P., the same acts which before insured the blessing of God, now call down his bitterest curse; an observance which before he esteemed to his honor, he now regards as the highest crime that can be committed against his Son! Cursed there for violating the Sabbath, and blessed here for the same acts! blessed there for keeping it, and cursed here for the same acts! And what a scene would be presented in the Judgment, should we see God in dealing with a race which have ever borne the *same relation* to him, bestowing upon one class his most benignant blessings for keeping his Sabbath, according to his promise, and turning to another class, and for the very same acts, visiting upon them his fiercest wrath! Elder Preble, is such the character of the God with whom we have to do!

Do you say that in quoting Heb. x, 28, 29, you had reference to such as were seeking justification and salvation outside of Christ? Then, as we have already shown, it has no application to Seventh-day Adventists, and you are simply fighting a man of straw of your own creation. We have gone upon the supposition that you were, according to your avowed purpose, arguing against the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, against which, unless you acknowledge a departure from the subject, you must have designed the quotation from Hebrews; and this being so, the impartial reader will pronounce our language none too severe.

Rom. viii, 4, is quoted. "The righteousness of the law" is "*FULFILLED in us*, who walk *not* after the flesh," or the law, says Eld. P., "*but after the SPIRIT.*" The word, fulfilled, is made emphatic by being put in small capitals, to which we respond, Amen. Right-

eousness, or a system of right doing, can be fulfilled only by conforming strictly thereto; and this scripture shows that the law is the standard of righteousness. The two verses 3 and 4 together present the idea thus: that the Son of God died for us *that* the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us. Yes, the righteousness of the law must be fulfilled in us; that is, we must attain to the same degree of righteousness as though we had never transgressed the law; but how shall this be done? Never by our own efforts alone; for we have already transgressed, and can never atone for those transgressions as already shown. It can only be done, therefore, through Christ. And as, through the merits of his blood, our past sins are cancelled, and we go on in obedience in the future, we are accounted as righteous as though we had never sinned, and *thus* the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us.

How different is this teaching of the apostle from the representation of our opponents that Christ died to abolish the law. Christ does not make us righteous by breaking down God's great standard of righteousness, so that it cannot be shown who is a sinner, but by opening a way whereby our characters can be made to conform to that standard. Eld. P. is again unfortunate in his comments on "the flesh." "Who walk not after the flesh" he says, "or the law." Now if flesh there means law, the text would read, "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the law!" But to speak of the righteousness of the law, or the righteousness which the law was designed to secure, being fulfilled by those who walk not after, or according to, the law, or in

other words, who are not living in obedience to the law, is absurd.

Preble.—"So much on the subject of the moral law, from Paul's letter to the Romans. Now let us turn to his letter to the Galatians, and see what we can find there. In the first place, I wish to quote again, as applicable to the '*law*,' what I have already quoted as applicable to the Sabbath: 'But there be some that trouble you, and would *pervert the gospel of Christ*. But though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.' Gal. i, 7-9.

REPLY.—The reader has seen thus far, and has still further proof here, that Eld. P.'s reasoning is altogether based on assumption. He accuses us of perverting the gospel of Christ. Why does he not show that our views of the moral law are contrary to the gospel? He certainly understands them, or should, before he pretends to write against them. He knows we believe with the apostle that by the moral law is the knowledge of sin. God's great standard of righteousness, the ten commandments, shows that we are sinners. He knows, then, that being convinced of sin, we fly to the gospel for the remedy, and look for redemption and salvation to Jesus Christ. How is this perverting the gospel of Christ, or preaching another gospel, and so subjecting ourselves to the curse. Eld. P., though unintentionally, we doubt not, abuses both Paul and us by such applications of scripture.

Again he assumes, on opening the book of Galatians that Paul there treats exclusively of the moral law. This needs to be proved. A few facts borne continually in mind will help us to understand what Paul has

written to the Galatians. It appears from the whole tenor of that epistle that the Galatians had been troubled with Judaizing teachers; that is, those who were endeavoring to enforce upon them the necessity of observing the Jewish ritual, and that through that they were to have justification from their transgressions of the moral law. Here is where the Jews stumbled. They mistook remission in figure through the ceremonial law, for remission in fact, and hence were satisfied with the former, and saw no need of the Saviour. Paul labors to confute this idea, and show them that they can be justified only through Christ. Hence Paul in Galatians frequently uses the word law in a broader sense than merely the ten commandments, and includes in it, those ceremonies which were connected with the transgression of those commandments under that dispensation—a system through which atonement was shadowed forth in figure, and which the Jews had fallen into the error of supposing was atonement in fact. In the light of these statements, which we think will stand the test of criticism, it will be seen as we proceed that Eld. P. in the main portion of his reasoning on Galatians entirely misses the mark.

Preble.—"One more passage I will quote from Paul's letter to the Galatians, which I think applicable to our times, in regard to the 'law,' as well as the apostle's times:

"But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is *not justified* by the *works of the law*, but by the *faith of Jesus Christ*, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that *we might be justified by*

the faith of Christ, and *not by the works of the law*; for by the *works of the law* shall *no flesh be justified*.' Gal. ii, 14-16.

"UNDER THE CURSE.—'For as many as are of the works of the law are *under the curse*; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that *no man is justified by the law in the sight of God*, it is evident; for, the just shall *live by faith*. And the law is *not of faith*; but, the man that doeth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: That the *blessing of Abraham* might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that *we* might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.' Gal. iii, 10-14.

"How important this testimony of the apostle. And we solemnly warn all those who are trying to 'be justified by the deeds of the law,' to make their escape as soon as possible, and GET OUT FROM 'UNDER THE CURSE.'

REPLY.—We are not trying to be justified by the law, hence, Eld. P.'s quotation and remarks are in no wise applicable to us.

Preble.—"But the apostle continues, 'For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? *It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made*; and it was *ordained by angels* in the hand of a mediator.' Then the apostle inquires, 'Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But *before faith came*, we were kept under the law, *shut up unto the faith* which should afterward be revealed.' Gal. iii, 18, 19, 21-23.

"Thus we see that, although *faith is come*, yet many keep themselves '*under the law—shut up!*' And while they are thus '*shut up*' in the old prison-house of the

'law,' yet they still try to teach others who have come out into the broad daylight of the gospel! Take heed, ye teachers of the 'law,' for you 'ARE UNDER THE CURSE.' Gal. iii, 10.

REPLY.—Still missing the mark. We do not teach the law as those did against whom Paul was writing; hence, there is nothing here applicable to us.

Preble,—“But now let us seriously inquire, WHAT WAS THE ‘LAW’ FOR? Let us all give audience, and the apostle Paul shall answer: “Wherefore the law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a school-master.”

REPLY.—If we understand Eld. P., he here argues on the assumption that the moral law was the school-master. Being under the school-master, would of course be under obligation to obey the precepts of that law, or the ten commandments; and not being under it, would be to be free from all obligation to obey those precepts. But, says Eld. P., “We are no longer under a school-master.” Then we shall understand him, shall we not, that we need no longer refrain from having other gods, making graven images, taking God’s name in vain, breaking the Sabbath, and violating the other six commands which regulate our duty to our fellow men? Oh, no, he will exclaim, there is the “moral law of the New Testament.” But hold. If the moral law of the New Testament enjoins upon us these same things, as it must do if it is a perfect law, and if it places us under the same restrictions, then it is just as much a school-master as the old law, and being under it, we are just as much under a school-master as before. There is no use in trying to make any distinction, or to evade this point. Let the reader test these arguments of the opposers of the law and Sabbath with this

one question. When they bring up such expressions as “justified by faith without the deeds of the law,” “not under a school-master,” &c., ask yourself, Do they mean to teach, by quoting such scriptures, that we are released from the moral duties enjoined in the ten commandments? If they do, then they betray a system of morality that is exceedingly rotten; and if they do not, they are guilty of a style of reasoning that is exceedingly shallow.

But to speak definitely on Gal. iii, 24, Paul does not mean by the word school-master, the ten commandments. What is there in the ten commandments to lead us to Christ? True, they reveal sin, and show us that we are transgressors; but they point out no way of escape, and lead us to no Saviour. What law then did lead to Christ? Answer, That law system by which the sacrifice and priestly work of the Saviour was so clearly shadowed forth. By this it was continually foreshown that a sacrifice was to be made which could take away sin, and a genuine Saviour provided for the world. See how Paul reasons from this system, in the book of Hebrews, to establish the sacrifice and priesthood of Christ. And we are no longer under that system of types and shadows that pointed us forward to a coming Saviour, but under the dispensation in which that Saviour himself acts as our great High Priest above.

Preble.—“May the Lord be praised, we have at last reached the grave of the OLD DEAD ‘SCHOOL-MASTER!’

“Now let us take heed, and follow no more the teachings of an old dead ‘SCHOOL-MASTER!’ For we are ‘no longer under a school-master,’ but under JESUS CHRIST, the Son of God. For ‘when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And be-

cause ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father.' Gal. iv, 4-6. 'Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.' For 'Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.' Gal. v, 1, 4. Therefore, whoever shall follow that old dead 'SCHOOL-MASTER'—the 'law'—instead of following Christ: we will say of them as the apostle said of the Galatians: 'YE ARE FALLEN FROM GRACE.'"

REPLY.—Another quite lengthy quotation, having no application to the case in hand; for we repeat again, we seek no justification through the law in any sense; and therefore do not belong to the number whom Paul accuses of falling from grace.

Preble.—"The Lord forgive me for the error of my head which led me to fall 'from grace,' and thus go back and try for three years to be 'justified by the deeds of the law,' by keeping the seventh-day Sabbath!"

REPLY.—We now have a definition of the expression "justified by the deeds of the law;" it is "keeping the seventh-day Sabbath!" It is a pity that Paul, who has had so much to say against attempting to be justified by the law, had not forever settled the question, if he meant the keeping of the Sabbath, by simply informing us of the fact!

But if Eld. P. was so blind, even though it was nineteen years ago, as to try to be justified by keeping the Sabbath, we join in his fervent request, that the Lord may forgive him. And we will also add, The Lord forgive him for endeavoring now to be justified while living in disobedience to the requirement of the Father, unaltered and unrepealed, which still says, Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.

Preble.—"Let us take heed, and attend to the warning the apostle gave to the Phillippians:

"Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision. For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and no confidence in the flesh."

"Why, Paul, 'no confidence in the flesh,' or in the 'law!' 'No confidence,' whatever, although he had tried it thoroughly, as he continues and says:

"Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more: Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the church; touching the righteousness which is in the law blameless." Verses 4, 6.

REPLY.—We are astonished that Eld. P., having once acknowledged the clear distinction between the ceremonial and the moral laws, should now betray such utter confusion on the subject, as to apply the word "flesh" to the moral law. Is the moral law ever called the flesh, in the Bible? Is it numbered among the carnal ordinances? Never. Paul says, Rom. vii, 14, that the law is *spiritual*, not carnal, or fleshly. What law then is designated by the term, the flesh? Answer, That law "which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal [fleshly] ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation," Heb. ix, 10, or "added till the seed should come." Gal. iii, 19.

And Paul, in the very scripture that Eld. P. has quoted, signifies, as plainly as language can do it, what law he is speaking of. He says, "If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more." Then follows the reason: "Circumcised the eighth day." Ah! then, circumcision forms

a part of what Paul here denominates the flesh. But was circumcision any part of the moral law? No; and Eld. P. has once admitted this. Paul goes on to say, that he was of the stock of Israel, and of the tribe of Benjamin, and a Pharisee. In the light of these statements there is no excuse for mistaking the law that Paul here refers to.

Preble.—“Now, for a few moments, let us attend to the apostle’s rule of working out ‘LOSS AND GAIN.’

‘But what things were *gain* to me, those I counted *loss* for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count *all things* but *loss* for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the *loss* of *all things*, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ. And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the *faith* of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by *faith*; that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.’ Phil. iii, 7-11.

REPLY.—Another irrelevant quotation. We know of no observer of the seventh-day Sabbath who thereby depends on his own righteousness. We all look to Christ for righteousness, and seek it through faith in him. Our only apology for so frequent a repetition on this point, is that our opponents so continually persist in misrepresenting us here.

Preble.—“Let us now attend to the APOSTLE’S CONCLUSION of this whole matter; for he says: ‘Let us therefore, as many as be *perfect*, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the *same rule*, let us mind the *same thing*. Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample.’ Phil. iii, 15-17.

“Here I must repeat: ‘Let us, therefore, as many as be *perfect*, be thus minded;’ and let us walk by the *same rule*, let us mind the *same thing*;’ and let us ‘mark them which walk so,’ as we have the apostle ‘for an ENSAMPLE.’ But did Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, ever teach them to observe ‘the seventh-day Sabbath?’ Never! Did he ever shun to declare to them ‘all the counsel of God?’ Never! Did he ever keep back any thing ‘that was profitable’ for the people to hear? Never! But he surely did keep back the seventh-day Sabbath! Therefore, it was not ‘profitable’ for him to teach it; and as we have him for an ensample, we had better ‘mind the same thing, and walk by the same rule.’ Amen. But those who choose to follow the teachings of the OLD DEAD SCHOOL-MASTER, instead of following Christ and the apostles, will probably teach the seventh-day Sabbath.”

REPLY.—In answer to such language as this, from a strenuous Sunday-keeper, we have only to say, “Did Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, ever teach them to observe” the first-day Sabbath? “Never!” Did he ever shun to declare to them “all the counsel of God?” Never! Did he ever keep back anything “that was profitable” for the people to hear? Never! “But he surely did keep back” the first-day Sabbath!—“Therefore, it was not profitable for him to teach it; and as we have him for an ensample, we had better ‘mind the same thing, and walk by the same rule.’ Amen. But those who choose to follow the teachings of the” “Mother of Harlots,” “instead of following Christ and the apostles, will probably teach the” first-day Sabbath.

Preble.—“WHEN, OR AT WHAT POINT OF THE WORLD’S HISTORY DID THE OLD SCHOOL-MASTER DIE? To answer this question, I will begin with a few words of the closing part of the Old Testament:

‘Remember ye the law of Moses, my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb, for all Israel, with

the statutes and judgments. Behold, I will send you *Elijah*, the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord; and *he* shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.' Mal. iv, 4-6.

"What law is here spoken of? The one the Lord commanded unto Moses in *Horeb*.' For whom was this law given? '*For all Israel*.' Will this law come to an end when '*Elijah*' comes? Let us now pass to the New Testament, and we shall see: '*For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John*.' And if ye will receive it, *this* is *ELIAS*, which was for to come. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. Matt. xi, 13-15. Hence, 'if ye will receive it,' '*Elijah*,' (Hebrew) or '*Elias*,' (Greek,) has come; and the law given to Moses '*in Horeb*' then, and there, in the time of '*John*,' '*deceased*.' '*For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John*.' Here, then, is the place where the old '*SCHOOL-MASTER*' died. 'He that hath ears to hear let him hear.' But '*Elijah*,' or '*Elias*,' or '*John*,' was only to '*prepare*' the way of the Lord Jesus; and thus it is said:

"John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake. He that cometh after me is preferred before me; for he was before me. And of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.' John i, 15-17.

"Hence the apostle says:

"For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth those things shall live by them. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring Christ down from above; or, who shall descend into the deep? that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead. But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe

in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.' Rom. x, 4-9.

"So we see that Christ is the end of the old law of works; but he is also the beginning of the new law of faith. And so it is written of Christ: 'There ariseth another priest, who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.' Heb. vii 15, 16. Praise God! 'Not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an ENDLESS LIFE.' Amen.

REPLY.—We find in the above another bundle of fallacies, which have become so numerous that we have ceased to number them. The principal ones contained in this last quotation from Eld. P., may be mentioned as follows:

1. The law spoken of in Mal. iv, 4-6, is the law which God commanded to Moses in Horeb, for all Israel, &c. Was that the ten commandments? By no means; for God did not command that law to Moses, for him to make known to the people, but spoke it to the people, direct, himself, from the summit of Sinai; neither did he trust the writing of it to Moses, or any other man, but wrote it himself on the tables of stone. Thus Eld. P. is again entirely off the question by marvelously confounding laws which he has once acknowledged to be separate and distinct.

2. There is nothing in Mal. iv, 4-6, to intimate that even the law of Moses, of which it speaks, (not the ten commandments,) would come to an end at the commencement of John's ministry.

3. The expression, "The law and the prophets prophesied until John," does not teach that the law there ceased. Luke says, The law and the prophets were [were preached] until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, &c. Luke xvi, 16. But if

this shows, as Eld. P. claims, that the law there ceased, it shows just as much that the prophets also ceased. If the law "there, in the time of John, deceased," the prophets then and there deceased also; and to be consistent he must abandon his teaching relative to the book of Daniel, and every other Old Testament prophet.

What then does the expression mean? Simply this: The law and the prophets prophesied, or were preached, Luke, until John, but since then the kingdom of God is preached. That is, all that the people had, up to the time of John, was the law and the prophets, but since then they have had the preaching of the kingdom of God, in addition to the law and prophets.

4. There is only one point mentioned in all the New Testament where anything is said to have ceased, to have been done away or abolished; and that is at the cross of Christ. Seemingly aware that this fact is essential to his purpose, Eld. P. then endeavors to throw an air of indefiniteness over the whole, as though John and Christ were about the same, and the testimony concerning either equally applicable to the case in hand. This method of reasoning will not do. If the law ceased at John, it did not cease at Christ; and if it ceased at Christ it did not cease at John. But Eld. P. has declared positively that in the time of John, the law "there deceased," and yet he quotes the testimony of Paul, as applicable to the same event, that *Christ is the end of the law*. If the law ceased at John's ministry, John was the end of it, not Christ, using the word end as Eld. P. understands it; but if Christ is the end of the law, the end of its existence, as Eld. P. holds, then it ceased with him, not with John. Both positions cannot be true. Our opponents are called upon

to state definitely which they will take. Such india-rubber modes of argument will not answer.

We have given the true meaning of the expression, "The law and the prophets were until John," and will now say a few words relative to the expression, "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness." Rom. x, 4. Our opponents almost uniformly quote as much as this, "Christ is the end of the law," and there stop, intending to convey the impression that Christ put an end to the existence of the law. But the reader will notice that Paul is careful to add, "*for righteousness*:" "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness;" and he does not stop there, but continues, "*To every one that believeth.*" Christ's being the end of the law, then, has to do only with believers; and if end there means, end of existence, the law is only abolished for Christians, and is still binding on the great mass of the world, who are yet in unbelief and sin. This is a sufficient condemnation of Eld. P.'s theory, which is that the law has never been binding on the Gentiles, be they saints or sinners. But we will not leave it here. The expression, "for righteousness," shows us in what sense Christ is the end of the law to the believer. It shows us that the law spoken of is the standard of righteousness, or that which is designed to secure righteousness. It shows that we in our lives have come short of that righteousness, and that Christ comes in to fill up the complement for us; that is, he accomplishes in the believer the purpose of the law, by securing to him perfect righteousness. Thus we can see how it is that this action of Christ affects only the believer. It is only to those who come to Christ for the pardon of their past transgressions of the law, that he becomes the end, object, purpose, or design, of the law, by impu-

ting to them his own righteousness. If Eld. P. has ever consulted Webster on the word, end, he has found a definition like this: "The ultimate point or thing at which one aims or directs his views; the object intended to be reached or accomplished by any action or scheme; purpose intended; scope; aim; drift." And if he has ever looked for its definition in Greek, he has found Greenfield giving one meaning as follows: "End, scope, object, principal point, the sum of anything;" and then referring to this very passage, Rom. x, 4, as an example of its use in this sense. And if he has ever consulted such passages as Rom. xiv, 9; 2 Cor. ii, 9; 1 Tim. i, 5; Heb. xiii, 7; Jas. v, 11, &c., he has seen some instances of a like use of the word in the Bible. As for instance, "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the *end* of the Lord;" surely not the end of his existence.

Preble—"Therefore, after the decease of the old 'school-master,' it was necessary to have a new law, or new commandments; and hence Christ declares to us one of THE NEW COMMANDMENTS in the following scriptures: 'A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.' 'This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you. These things I command you, that ye love one another.'" John xiii, 34, 35; xv, 12, 17.

REPLY.—Amid all the dust and confusion raised by the opponents of the law and Sabbath, it is necessary often to remind the reader of the true point at issue, and to refer to the principles for which we contend, and which they oppose. Remember then that our position is, that the moral law, summarily contained in the ten commandments, is, and ever has been, God's great constitution for the government of this world;

that these commandments have, from Eden down, been binding, not upon any particular class alone, but upon all the world, as Paul, in Rom. iii, clearly shows; that this is the law which God by the Psalmist pronounces perfect, Ps. xix, 7; the law, the keeping of which Solomon tells us is the whole duty of man, Eccl. xii, 13; that this law is in no wise affected, either in its character or duration, by the giving of the ceremonial law to the Jews, and the abrogation of that law by Jesus Christ, but that it continues right on, as an unimpaired whole, binding upon the world, and is to be the standard of character at the last day. Jas. ii, 12.

If that law was perfect as David declares, then God could not alter or abolish it, without marring his own work; for a perfect law can no more be altered and still be perfect, than there can be two straight lines between two given points, or two centers to the same circle. To argue, therefore, as the opposers of the Sabbath do, that that law which was once perfect has been changed or abolished, is to argue that God's system of government is now imperfect.

Another thought relative to the abolition of the law. As already stated, whatever the New Testament declares to have been abolished, it as plainly declares was abolished at the cross. No change can be shown to have taken place in anything except that which was included in the "hand writing of ordinances," which was "blotted out," and "nailed to the cross." But can this language be applied to the ten commandments? These commandments were written on stone; and how would a man look, we ask, to carry out the figure, nailing tables of stone to a cross? or endeavoring with ink, to "blot out" what God had engraved deep in those tables with his own finger? Both the idea and

the figure would be incongruous and absurd. But apply this, as the apostle does, to the book of the law of Moses, the ceremonial law, the Jewish ritual, and there is harmony and appropriateness in the figure; for what was written with ink, could be blotted out with ink, and it was a custom in those days, when a law expired by limitation or subsequent enactment, to nail up the parchment on which it was written, in some conspicuous place, that all might see that it had ceased to exist. From this custom comes the figure of Christ's nailing to the cross that body of ceremonies contained in the hand writing of ordinances. With this view there is harmony throughout; but to apply it to the ten commandments, is to violate every principle of propriety, and make Paul the merest simpleton in the use of figures.

Again. We affirm without fear of contradiction that the view of the law above set forth, would be the view of nearly all, if not all, Bible believers at the present time, were it not for the Sabbath question. We make this assertion on the very apparent ground that it is only since the Sabbath controversy has arisen that men have begun to talk so glibly about the ceremonial nature, the carnality, and the abolition of the law of God. The good and pious of past ages have expressed views relative to the law, its holiness, immutability and perpetuity, exactly such as we now advocate. But the Christian world is of late beginning to awake to the fact, that that law which in times past they have so highly and so justly extolled, demands a day of rest different from the one they find themselves observing. They are beginning to learn that by some means and by some power, a new day has been foisted into the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment of

the decalogue, and they betrayed into the practice of keeping it. We can tell them where it came from, if they wish to know. It originated with the first great rebel against the government of Heaven, was by him inducted into all the abominations of heathenism, then into the corruptions of the papacy, and finally landed in the very bosom of all the creeds of Protestantism. See history of the Sabbath. Finding themselves in this position, they have apparently debated the question thus: Shall we still adhere to the high estimate we have placed upon the law, and change our practice to conform to its requirements, or shall we at all events still adhere to our present practice, and make the law, or our theory, even if it involves the abolition of the law, conform to our practice? And too many have set themselves to work to accomplish this latter result. We are sorry to see Eld. P. laboring so zealously in their unworthy ranks.

It is here that we and our opponents have parted company, and this is the issue between us. Occupying, years ago, common ground in reference to the law of God, when it was ascertained that our practice was not conformable to its requirements, we did not choose to surrender our views of its sanctity and binding obligation to suit our circumstances. We believe that the views formerly held by such good men as Wesley and others, in reference to the law of God, are all right, and knowing, according to the obvious principle of logic, that whatever is affirmed of anything as a whole is affirmed of all the particulars contained under it, when we find the law as a whole brought over into this dispensation, still binding upon the world, and the great instrument used in the conversion of the sinner, see Paul's experience in Rom. vi and vii, we know that

each item of that law is just as much binding as though individually re-affirmed. In that law we have found a Sabbath, which we have accepted. In that law our opponents also find a Sabbath which they have rejected, and to avoid the claim of which, they even discard the law itself.

But we must return from this digression to a more particular conflict with hydra-headed error; to a painful consideration of assumptions, assertions, false premises and false conclusions. This holy and living law of God, Eld. P. seems to take peculiar delight in denouncing as "the old dead school-master." And after the decease of the "old school-master," says he, it was necessary to have a new law, or new commandments; and hence Christ declares to us one of the new commandments, to love one another. But stop a moment. The law died, if it died at all, at the cross of Christ; but this commandment that Eld. P. refers to, was spoken by Christ, while yet engaged in his public ministry. Hence Eld. P. has a part of the new law enacted before the old was abolished! Here, says he, "is one of the new commandments." Where are the rest? Was the new law given in a hap-hazard and piecemeal manner? If so, who shall collect these commandments, and give them to us in the form of a code entire? No one has done this in the New Testament. And why did not Christ, when he commenced to give the new law, if he designed to legislate in the place of the old, give us a complete law at once, and inform us of his purpose in so doing? Was he not capable of it? Did not the circumstances of the case require it? All will agree certainly that the repeal of a law should be as explicit as its enactment, and that the new law should be no less precise than the old, both as to the

time of its enactment, and the terms in which it is expressed. The ten commandments were once declared to men from Sinai, with the mighty voice of God, while the mountain quaked, the earth trembled, and the hearts of the people fainted at the sublime manifestations of the divine majesty. And now shall we allow a person to impose upon our better judgment, by telling us that because Christ enjoined upon his disciples, in a private manner, to love one another, or an apostle wrote occasionally and years apart, to some of his converts, exhorting them in reference to some of these requirements, that this was the enactment of a new law, that the old was hereby abolished, and the new took its place, while yet Christ and his apostles have given us no intimation of any such thing? Another feature fatal to this position, is the fact that if Christ re-enacted the law, it was re-enacted before the old was abolished, which would be absurd; and if the apostles, as is sometimes contended, re-enacted it, then years elapsed between the abolition of the old and the enactment of the new; years in which God had no law for the government of the world; and as "where no law is, there is no transgression," Rom. iv, 15, years in which all iniquity might be committed without sin! If the first view is absurd, an imposition on human reason, this is blasphemous; for it impeaches the wisdom of Omniscience. Oh shameful confusion! Oh Egyptian darkness! Reader, we appeal to your common sense: is it not more reasonable and scriptural to believe that God so legislated in the beginning as never afterward to find himself under the necessity of giving a new law to man, and then resorting to weak and impotent human means for its enactment!

But you may ask, What then does Christ mean by a

new commandment? To which we reply, that he certainly could not mean that his commandment was new in the sense of now first having an existence; for we find in the days of Moses, in the book of Leviticus, an express injunction to love our neighbors as ourselves. Christ enjoined no more than this. But the spirit of this command had been lost from the hearts of the people, and Christ renewed it. And the same John who records these words of our Lord, says in his second epistle, that it was not a new commandment, as then first having an existence, but one which they had "had from the beginning." 2 John 5. It is called new, then, simply because renewed. Just as we read in 2 Cor. v, 17, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," not then first made or created, but simply renovated or renewed.

Preble.—"In this connection, we have an 'example' given us by our Saviour of the practical bearing of this 'new commandment.' It is found in the first part of John xiii:

"CHRIST WASHING THE DISCIPLES' FEET.—And as some contend that Jesus commanded his people to attend to the washing of feet, in connection with the ordinance of the Lord's supper, as a part of the ordinance itself, I am led here to say, this is a mistake! It is not so! There is no *command* or precept about it. The Greek word for *command*, or precept; as used by the Saviour in this connection, is *entolee*; meaning 'precept, command, law,' etc. But the original word, used by Christ in John xiii, 15, when he says, 'I have given you an *example*,' is *hupodigma*; meaning 'an example, *proposed for imitation or admonition*,' etc. (Greenfield's Lexicon.) And in this case we shall find that the 'example' of Christ was for '*admonition*,' for the disciples deserved it. The case was this: The disciples had first been engaged in a '*strife*' among themselves, to see 'which of them should be accounted the *greatest*,' (Luke

xxii, 24,) and the spirit of selfishness and rivalry was in direct violation of the true import of the '*new commandment*.' Hence, 'their Lord and Master' just set them an '*example*' of humility and '*love*' toward each other; they must be *servants* to each other, and never strive to see 'which of them should be accounted the *greatest*.' Thus we see that '*love one to another*' is the '*fulfilling*' of Christ's *new law or commandments*; as we find in Rom. xiii, 8-10:

"Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that *loveth* another hath *fulfilled* the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other *commandment*, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore, *love* is the *fulfilling* of the law.'

"It appears that this '*example*' of Christ was enough for the disciples while they lived, for we never find them, after this, washing each other's feet in connection with the Lord's supper. They doubtless remembered this '*example*' of their 'Lord and Master' to 'love one another,' as Christ had loved them; and so there was no more '*strife*' among them at the Lord's table to see 'which of them should be accounted the *greatest*.' And so would I recommend to all who feel like '*strife*,' to see who shall 'be accounted the *greatest*,' just to *wash one another's feet* until they '*have love one to another*.' But we need not wash each other's feet, as a part of the ordinance of the Lord's supper, because Christ commanded us to do it; for he never did any such thing. But under similar circumstances, we had better follow the '*example*' of 'our Lord and Master;' and then, as he says, 'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them;' yes, 'happy' are we, if we only keep the '*new commandment*' to '*love one another*,' for there is no *unhappiness or fear in love*.' We shall be '*happy*' if we only follow Christ's '*example*;' for '*perfect love casteth out fear*.'

"God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made

perfect, that we may have *boldness* in the *day of judgment*; because as he is, so are we in this world. There is *no fear in love*; but perfect love casteth out fear; because *fear hath torment*. He that feareth is not made perfect in love." 1 John iv, 16-18.

REPLY.—We have chosen to give what Eld. P. says on John's record of Christ's washing the disciples' feet, at one extract, it forms so novel a portion of an argument against the Sabbath. The connection between Sabbath-keeping and washing the saints' feet, we leave the reader to ascertain if he can. But as we are reviewing Eld. P., it is of course our duty to follow him, wherever he may lead. And yet we cannot do this without apologizing to the reader for so far departing from the subject. We are in the position of the boy ploughing, who was told to make a straight furrow across the field. On inquiring how he should do it, his father told him to drive straight to the old red cow on the other side of the field. The boy started, and the cow started too! However, he obeyed orders and followed her all over the field. And if his furrow was not quite so straight, he could plead that he had only followed directions. So if our reasoning is not always on the subject in hand, our apology is that we are only following Eld. P.

In relation to the subject of washing feet, we can give no better reply to Eld. P.'s remarks than is found in the words of the "living Jesus." Eld. P. has thus far manifested a remarkable passion for long quotations of scripture; and it strikes us as a little singular that on this point he has kept the language of the "living Jesus" entirely out of sight. But let Eld. P., as well as all others, give careful audience while the great Teacher speaks upon this question:

"Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God; he riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself. After that he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter saith unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter. Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all. For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean. So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." John xiii, 3-17.

When our Lord says, as above, "If I then your Lord and Master have washed your feet, *ye* ought also to *wash one another's* feet," does he mean that we should do it, or that we should not? When he says, "For I have given you an *example*, that *ye* should do *as* I have

done to you," does he mean that we should do so, or do something else! And when he says, "If ye know *these things*, happy are ye if ye do *them*," does he mean these things or something else! It is not a little surprising that Eld. P., while so strenuously professing to be a follower of the teachings of the "living Jesus," should so soon join issue with his teachings, endeavor to explain away his words, and avoid obedience to his plain and explicit requirements.

But oh, if Eld. P. could have found any such language as this relative to Sunday-keeping, would it have been treated thus? If he could only have found where Christ kept Sunday, and then told his disciples, "If I then, your Lord and Master, have kept the first day of the week, ye ought also to keep the first day of the week; for I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done," would not his language have been taken in its most literal and apparent sense, and considered a sufficient settlement of the Sunday controversy? But Eld. P. endeavors to explain away this language when applied to the washing of feet, and rejects that ordinance, while he accepts the Sunday institution on evidence that is not one-thousandth part as direct. Let him say no more about the "living Jesus," until he can pay as much regard to his language when applied to the humiliating ordinance of washing feet, as he would to the same language if uttered in behalf of the popular institution of Sunday-keeping.

Preble.—"WHAT IS THE NEW LAW CALLED?—It is called '*The perfect law of liberty*'"—'*The royal law*;' as we find in James i, 25; ii, 8, 12. We are sure that it is the *new law* of Christ that is here called '*the perfect law of liberty*;' for the apostle says: '*The law*'—that is, the old law—the old '*school-master*'—*made nothing perfect*;' but '*it was the bringing in*' (margin) '*of a better hope*;' as we learn from Heb. vii, 19; Acts

xiii, 39; '*For the law made nothing perfect*, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God.' 'And by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye *could not be justified by the law of Moses*.'"

REPLY.—In his endeavors to find a name for his new law, Eld. P. reminds us of his reasoning on the law in Rom. vii. He here goes to James and contends that the name of his new law is the royal law, the perfect law of liberty. In his argument on Romans we find this language: "And first here we *prove positively* that the law here spoken of is not the ceremonial, but the *moral law*; for we see by referring to verse 3, of this same chapter, that the law referred to is that which speaks of adultery; and this sin is the one mentioned in the seventh commandment of the decalogue; and this is what gives us the positive proof that the *moral law* is the one referred to." We take him on his own ground in reference to the law referred to by James. In Jas. ii, 10-12, we read, "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all; for he that said [margin, *that law which said*] *Do not commit adultery*, said, also, *Do not kill*. Now, if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." What law was it which said these things, to which James in his day could refer? Answer, the old moral law of the decalogue, and that alone. Now Eld. P. argues that a reference to the seventh commandment, in Rom. vii, is *positive proof* that it is the moral law of the decalogue which is referred to there. Hence, on his own ground, a reference to the sixth and seventh commandments in James ii, is positive proof that it is the moral law of the decalogue that is referred to there. But Eld. P.

overlooks this fact, and is very sure that the law is not referred to here, because it is "the perfect law of liberty," and Paul in Heb. vii, 19, speaking of some law, says that the "law made nothing perfect." What law does Paul refer to in Heb. vii? The moral law of the ten commandments? No, sir; but the ceremonial law. The sum of the argument, then, is this: Eld. P. through a mention of *one* commandment in Rom. vii, sees "positive proof" that the moral law of the decalogue is referred to there; but though *two* of those commandments are mentioned here in James ii, he sees no proof in them that the moral law is referred to here, but on the contrary, is quite sure that it is the "*new law of Christ*," because Paul in Heb. vii, says that the old ceremonial law could make nothing perfect! The reader will see plainly enough that James, by the royal law, and law of liberty, means nothing else but the original moral law, as contained in the ten commandments; and Eld. P.'s imaginary "new law" must go without a name awhile longer.

Preble.—"I know that there are those who contend for the seventh-day Sabbath, that say this '*royal law*,' as in James ii, 8, is the old law of the Decalogue; and thus they try to enforce their theory in regard to the Sabbath. But they thus '*pervert the gospel of Christ*.' For James says:—'*If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well.*' What law is this, then, which the apostle says is according to the Scripture?" It is this: '*Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*' And where do we find this law? Where did it have its origin? With the old '*schoolmaster*,' or with Christ? We will see:—

'Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.' This is the first and great com-

mandment. And the second is like unto it, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.* On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.' Matt. xxii, 38-40.

But again, 'For this is the *message* (commandment margin) that ye heard from the beginning, that we should *love one another*.' 'Beloved, let us *love one another*: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, *because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.* Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God *so* loved us, we ought *also* to love one another.' 'I rejoiced greatly that I found of thy children walking in truth, *as we have received a commandment from the Father.* And now I beseech thee, lady, not as though I wrote a new commandment unto thee, but that which we had from the beginning, that we *love one another*. And this is love, that we walk after his commandments. *This is the commandment, That, as ye have heard from the beginning, ye should walk in it.*' 1 John iii, 11; iv, 7-11; and 2 John iv, 6.

"Who would not choose to follow the LIVING JESUS, rather than the old dead '*schoolmaster*'?"

REPLY. As we were preparing to show the erroneous position involved in the extract just given, a private note was received from Eld. P. containing the following paragraph in relation to it, in which his statements are withdrawn, and a reply rendered unnecessary. He says:

"I committed one error through inattention which I hope pardon for; for I did not discover it until it was too late for correction. It is found in Crisis of March 1st, p. 94, near the close of my article. It is where I say that the phrase, '*Thou shalt love thy neighbor as*

thyself,' originated with Christ. This is not true, as the same is found in Lev. xix, 18."

This is a surrender of the whole argument on Jas. ii, and also on the "new commandment." We honor Eld. P.'s frankness in taking back an argument when he sees it to be incorrect. But the erroneous statement has gone forth through the Crisis to its six thousand subscribers, and a private confession of it to this Office will not be sufficient. Justice to his own conscience will demand that the retraction should be made as public as the wrong statement. And when this is done, he will find no unwillingness on our part to grant the "pardon" for which he "hopes."

In the conclusion of the last extract from his article he says, "Who would not choose to follow the LIVING Jesus rather than the old 'dead schoolmaster?'" To say nothing of the inappropriateness in the figure of following a dead schoolmaster, we affirm that Eld. P., is not following the living Jesus in his adherence to Sunday. And on this point we will let Preble of 1845 answer Preble of 1864. In his tract written in 1845 he says:

"And John Calvin, in his 'Institution of the Christian Religion,' p. 128, says, 'The Old Fathers put in the place of the Sabbath the day we call Sunday.' Mark this! *The Old Fathers did it!* Not the God of Heaven!! Whom will we obey? Thus we see Dan. vii, 25 fulfilled, the 'little horn' changing 'times and laws.' Therefore it appears to me that all who keep the first day of the week for '*the Sabbath*,' are *Pope's Sunday keepers!!* and *GOD'S SABBATH BREAKERS!!!*"

Adopting Eld. P.'s style of interrogation, we now inquire, Who would not choose to follow the living Father and his Son Jesus, rather than the "mother of harlots?"

Preble.—"THE LORD JESUS CHRIST FULFILLED THE LAW. Strictly speaking, we should say that the Lord Jesus *has* 'fulfilled,' or *will* 'fulfill,' the Old Testament law; rather than to say he abrogated it. We will first notice the passage found in Matt. v, 17, 18;—

"Think not that I am come to *destroy* the law, or the prophets; I am not come to *destroy*, but to *fulfill*. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till *all* be fulfilled."

Let us take particular notice of our Saviour's language in this passage:—"I am not come to *destroy*, but to *fulfill*." If, then, he *fulfills* any portion of the law, of course he does not *destroy* it. He says in Luke:—"The law and the prophets were *until* John," etc., and then adds:—"It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Now he does not mean that he will *not fulfill any* of the law or the prophets 'till heaven and earth pass;' and thus '*all* be fulfilled' at one time, after the heavens and earth have passed away, for he says, '*I am come to fulfill*.' Hence, whatever he *fulfilled* of the law and the prophets, he did '*not destroy*;' neither did it '*fail*.' And if he fulfilled a part at his first advent, and then completes the fulfillment at his second advent, none of it *fails*, and none of it is *destroyed*."

REPLY.—Of the meaning of the word fulfill as applied to a moral law, we have already spoken at sufficient length. In his remarks upon the law in Romans, Eld. P. used this language; "That law is 'dead,' or, in other words it is 'fulfilled.' We do not wonder that he should hesitate to leave the matter in just that shape; but all his explaining will not be able to cover up the fact that he believes that the law is abrogated, destroyed, abolished, because fulfilled. And then, on his own ground, as already shown, the law of Christ is abrogated, and we are left without any law either old or new, according to Gal. vi, 2; and he cannot deny it. More on Matt. v, hereafter."

Preble.—"Now to the word and to the testimony. WHAT DID THE LORD JESUS FULFILL AT HIS FIRST ADVENT? Why, says one, he fulfilled all the ceremonial lay of Moses. Not so fast—hold a moment. Was the 'Passover' fulfilled at the first advent? Certainly it was, says the objector. *Certainly it was not*, says the Scriptures; for we read:—

"And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat *this passover* with you before I suffer: For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, *until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.*' Luke xxii, 14-16.

"Thus we see that Christ did not fulfill the '*passover*,' but it is to '*be fulfilled in the kingdom of God*'—at 'the marriage supper of the Lamb,' (Rev. xix, 9,) when, as Christ says,—'Ye may eat and drink at my table in MY KINGDOM.' (Luke xxii, 30.) Glory to God and the Lamb. Amen."

REPLY. We have already shown how the typical dispensation as a whole has ceased, and the antitypical taken its place, and that no type can reach over into this dispensation. To speak more particularly of the passover, we read in 1 Cor. v, 7, "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." There is no mistaking this language of the apostle. It is a plain declaration that Christ is *our* passover; that is, that the passover has been fulfilled in Christ; the paschal sacrifice has met its antitype in the death of the Redeemer. Now does this language of the apostle contradict the words of Christ, Luke xxii, 16, as quoted by Eld. P.? If Eld. P.'s interpretation of them is correct, they do; but we do not believe there is any contradiction; and for this reason: because there is no evidence at all that Christ is speaking of the passover as a type, and designing to instruct us in its fulfillment. Paul does design thus to instruct us by his words in Corinthians; hence

his language is definite. No such design being involved in the language of Christ, it is indefinite; and here Eld. P. falls into error in taking the indefinite to explain the definite. Whatever Christ's language does mean, it is evident that he refers only to a particular instance. He says "*This passover, not the passover*;" meaning that particular occasion, and not the passover as an institution. We think his language means simply what is expressed in verse 18, the next verse but one; namely, that he would not again eat and drink with his disciples as he was then doing till it should be accomplished or fulfilled, or take place in the kingdom of God; that was the last occasion of that kind he was ever to enjoy with them till the kingdom of God should come.

Preble.—"STRIKING POINTS OF ANALOGY BETWEEN THE PASSOVER AND THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH. The following are some of the points which impress the mind of the close observer:—1. Both had their origin in the Old Testament times. *The passover:* 'And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout *your generations*; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance *forever*. Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses; for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, *that soul shall be cut off from Israel.* And in the first day there shall be an *holy* convocation, and in the seventh day there shall be an *holy* convocation to you: *no manner of work* shall be done in them, save that which every man must eat, that only may be done of you. And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in this self-same day have I brought *your armies* out of the land of Egypt: therefore shall ye observe this day in *your generations forever.*'—Ex. xii, 14-17. *The Sabbath:* 'Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a *sign* be-

tween me and you throughout *your generations*; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is *holy unto you*: every one that defileth it shall *surely be put to death*: for whosoever doeth *any work therein*, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, *holy to the Lord*. Whosoever doeth *any work* in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the *children of Israel* shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath *throughout their generations* for a *perpetual covenant*. It is a *sign* between me and the *children of Israel forever*: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.'

From these portions of Scripture we learn that, 2. Both were '*holy*' institutions. 3. Both forbid all manner of '*work*.' 4. Both were for a '*memorial*' or '*sign*.' 5. Both were to be observed by a particular class of people—'*the children of Israel*.' 6. Both were *limited*, not only to a particular class of persons; but also, as in respect to the time for their observance '*throughout your generations*,' or '*forever*.' 7. In both cases, the penalty for a violation was—'*that soul shall be cut off from Israel*'—or '*he shall surely be put to death*.' We also learn from the New Testament Scriptures that, 8. Both were to cease in their observance, after the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, throughout the gospel dispensation. (Luke xxii, 16; Heb. iv, 8.) 9. Both had a *substitute* appointed, viz.: '*the passover*'—'*THE LORD'S SUPPER*' (1 Cor. xi, 20) and '*the Sabbath*'—'*THE LORD'S DAY*.' (Rev. i, 10.) And 10. Both were to have their complete fulfillment in '*the kingdom of God*,' or in '*the new earth*.' Luke xxii, 16, 30; Rev. xix, 9; Heb. iv, 6-11; Rev. xx, 4, 6."

REPLY.—We are more and more surprised at Eld. P.'s mode of presenting this subject. He has once admitted, as the reader will well remember, the plain distinction between the moral and ceremonial laws;

but now we find him laboring long and patiently to break down that distinction and confound the two together. If this was his design at first, how shall we account for his former admission that the ten commandments constituted the moral law, and were distinct from the ceremonial. It is not usual for a commander, in time of war, to throw up breastworks for the use of the enemy, or to lay a train of powder un- his own fortifications.

Points of analogy between the passover and the seventh-day Sabbath! Well what if there are? Suppose there are five hundred? What of that? He has proved nothing on these three essential particulars, namely that they were the same in their origin, nature and design. Both had their origin says he in "old-Testament times." Old-Testament times cover a space of over four thousand years. Is that as definite as his theory will permit him to be? If so, we much prefer a different one.

Let us notice a few points apparently overlooked by Eld. P., in which the "analogy" between the passover and seventh-day Sabbath, does not hold good.

1. The Sabbath was instituted at creation; the passover not till the exode from Egypt twenty-five hundred years thereafter.

2. The Sabbath was instituted before the fall of man; the passover not till after that fall.

3. The Sabbath was moral in its nature; the passover ceremonial.

4. The Sabbath was uttered by the voice of God, and engraved with his finger in the very bosom of his moral law; the passover was written in the book by Moses, and was a part of the hand-writing of ordinances.

5. The Sabbath was a memorial of creation; the passover was a memorial of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt.

6. The Sabbath was to be observed by all without distinction of nationality; the passover was to be observed by the Jews alone. This is proved from the fact that no one could partake of the passover without joining himself by the outward rite of circumcision to the Jewish church. Ex. xii, 48. "And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one born in the land; for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof." But how was it with the stranger in reference to the Sabbath? Ans. The *stranger* was to observe that as well as the Jew. "In it" says the fourth commandment, "thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, *nor thy stranger that is within thy gates.*" No fact could more clearly show the distinction between the two institutions. The passover was a purely Jewish ordinance, and was to be observed by the members of the Jewish church alone; but the Sabbath being a universal moral law, was binding on the foreigner and stranger equally with the Jew. Let the opponent explain this away if he can.

In reference to the Sabbath's being a sign to the children of Israel throughout their generations, we have already spoken. He who says that it was "limited" to that people, is not only wise above, but contrary to, what is written. We have shown how the Sabbath and the other nine commandments, aside from their existence on the tables of stone as the exclusive moral law

of God, were also for the time incorporated into the civil code of the Jewish nation. This will account for all Eld. P.'s "points of analogy" between the passover and Sabbath so far as they exist. His eighth, ninth, and tenth points, however, we deny *in toto* so far as the Sabbath is concerned. 1. There is no evidence that the Sabbath was to cease after the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. 2. There was no substitute ever appointed for the Sabbath; neither was there for the passover. Both are unqualified assumptions. 3. Neither was the Sabbath a type, as we have previously and abundantly shown, to be fulfilled as such in the new earth. And these propositions being mere assertions, we will dismiss them for the present with a simple denial.

Preble.—"THE LORD'S DAY," THE TRUE CHRISTIAN SABBATH. About sixty-two years after the resurrection of Christ—or after the christian Sabbath began—the 'beloved' John, who was our 'brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ,' while he 'was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ,' said—'*I was in the Spirit on THE LORD'S DAY,*' etc. Here shines the clear blazing light of the christian Sabbath, according to the gospel of THE LIVING JESUS: notwithstanding so many are trying, with a '*veil upon their hearts,*' to throw a dark cloud over the whole thing, by saying, that the 'Lord's day' here spoken of 'is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment,' as found in Ex. xx, 8-11. But how many, through ignorance, 'pervert the gospel of Christ.'"

REPLY.—We are here treated to another assumption, and an effort is then made to prevent any further examination of the subject in the mind of the reader, by the insinuation that to believe otherwise would be a manifestation of "ignorance" and a perversion of the

gospel of Christ. This mode of argument may do for some; but it will not answer with the candid, and those who are sincerely inquiring to know the truth. At this point we cannot forbear introducing the following extract from Tappan's late standard work on logic, p. 385: "It is therefore always an important inquiry, whether the principles with which we begin are sufficiently established to be made the premises of an argument. A judicious and honest reasoner will be cautious in this respect; but it is of the nature of sophistry boldly to assume, and to supply by a show of confidence, the want of a true and adequate basis. 'Sometimes men are shamed into admitting an unfounded assertion, by being confidently told that it is so evident that it would argue great weakness to doubt it.'"

"The Lord's day" says Eld. P. is "the true Christian Sabbath." Where does he find the term "Christian Sabbath?" Did he get it from the "living Jesus" or his apostles? No. It is an expression that has been born of apostasy and rebellion against God's true law. The Bible says nothing about a *Jewish Sabbath* or *Christian Sabbath* as such. It knows but one weekly Sabbath, and that is the "Sabbath of the Lord," from Genesis to Revelation. With this exception, we agree with the proposition that "the Lord's day" is the day that Christians should observe for the Sabbath. But what day is the Lord's day? Is it necessary for us to re-iterate the evidence on this point? For those who have any acquaintance with the Sabbath controversy it is not; but for the benefit of such as have not, we will briefly state it. At the close of the first week of time God sanctified or set apart the Sabbath to a holy use. He thus gave to man the six

working days of the week, and reserved the Sabbath for his day. In the fourth commandment it is styled the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. He calls it by the prophet, "My holy day." We come down to the New Testament and find the Lord Jesus Christ, who in all the purposes and plans of creation and redemption, is one with the Father, by whom also the worlds were made, declaring that he is the Lord of the Sabbath; and finally John, who heard this declaration of our Lord's, declares that he was in the Spirit on the Lord's day. Now what day is the Lord's day? Is not the conclusion legitimate and necessary that that day is the Lord's day of which he has declared himself the Lord? But Eld. P. says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day; and what testimony does he offer? Not a syllable; from the fact that there is not a syllable that he can offer. Neither the Father nor the Son have ever claimed the first day of the week in any sense; that day has never been distinguished from the other working days; no blessing has ever been placed upon that day; it has never been set apart for man; there is no divine precept enjoining upon any one to keep it; nor have we any example either from Christ or his apostles for its observance. Yet, according to Eld. P., in the absence of all these and every other conceivable proof, to claim that by Lord's day is meant the first day of the week, is the "blazing light of the Christian Sabbath!" but to say that by Lord's day is meant that day which has ever been enjoined upon us as divine, and of which Christ expressly declared that he was the Lord;—this, forsooth, is to have a "vail" upon our hearts, to throw a "dark cloud over the whole thing," to betray "ignorance," and "pervert the gospel of Christ!" If Christ had even once affirmed that

he was Lord of the first day of the week, think a moment what use would have been made of that. We need say no more, to cause such assertions to recoil with terrible severity upon the head of their author.

Preble.—"The word here rendered 'Lord's' is in the Greek *kuriakos*, and it is found elsewhere in the New Testament but *once*, and this is in 1 Cor. xi, 20, where it refers to the 'Lord's (*kuriakos*) Supper.' The question now arises, Whose 'supper' is here referred to? Is it the Lord JEHOVAH's supper? or is it the Lord JESUS CHRIST's supper? All must confess that it is the Lord JESUS CHRIST's supper. Then is the 'LORD's (*kuriakos*) DAY,' Rev. i, 10, the Lord JESUS CHRIST's day. Thus we have the plain word of God to establish this long-disputed truth. Praise God. *Amen.* Here, then, we have the proof that 'the passover' had, as its substitute, the 'Lord's (*kuriakos*) supper;' and as a substitute for 'the Sabbath,' the 'Lord's (*kuriakos*) day,' as I have above stated: *the passover* to have its complete fulfillment in 'the kingdom of God;' Luke xxii, 16; and just so of the *Sabbath*. Heb. iv, 3; Rev. xx, 4."

REPLY.—We are sorry to spoil Eld. P.'s joy at his imaginary discovery; but we fail to see any long-disputed truth established by his testimony. In the first place, we were not aware that it was disputed that Lord's day in Rev. i, 10, means the Lord JESUS CHRIST's day. We have never disputed it. We should consider it very foolish to do so, since the Lord JESUS CHRIST has expressly declared that there is a certain day of which he is Lord. We only deny that that day is the Lord's day, which he has never even taken into his lips, and only claim that the day meant by Lord's day is the day of which he claims to be Lord; and that is not the first day of the week, but the Sabbath. But, says the objector, that day is Jehovah's day, not Christ's day. Then we repeat, by Jesus Christ God made the

worlds. In the work of creation, and redemption the Father and the Son are one; and the Sabbath is as much the Sabbath of the Lord JESUS CHRIST, as it is the Sabbath of the Lord JEHOVAH. We know that the Sabbath is the day for which the Father challenges a special regard as his; for he has plainly told us so; and we know that the Sabbath is the day of the Lord JESUS CHRIST; for he has as plainly stated that fact. Here is indeed a long-disputed truth established by the plain word of God. Here is where the "Praise God" and "Amen" belong, and not where Eld. P. has placed them.

But he continues, "Here, then, we have the proof that the passover had as its substitute the Lord's supper." Where is the proof? We have not found it. There is certainly in 1 Cor. xi, not the least allusion to the passover. And as to the Lord's day's being "a substitute for the Sabbath," it is itself the Sabbath. But why talk of a substitute for the Sabbath? The Bible calls for no such thing. One Sabbath has been given to man as a part of a law which has been declared to be perfect, and of universal and perpetual obligation. Why look for another? As well might we look for a substitute for Thou shalt not kill, or Thou shalt not steal. And as to the first day of the week having taken the place of the Sabbath, there is not only no testimony to any such effect, but the first day does not possess one single feature which it must possess in order to be a Sabbath. 1. No divine being ever rested upon it, of which we have any record. 2. No blessing was ever placed upon it. 3. It was never sanctified or set apart for man's use. 4. There is no command found anywhere in the Bible for its observance. The first law that was ever given in support of

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER

James White Library

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

Sunday, was the decree of Constantine, A. D. 321, which was issued in behalf of that day as a heathen festival. See History of the Sabbath. 5. No Bible writer has ever set us the example of resting on that day. 6. Every mention of the first day of the week in the New Testament, is an allusion to it as a day for secular business, and not for religious rest or worship. 7. There is no intimation that that day, or any other, was ever to take the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. Under these circumstances, those who are endeavoring to bolster up such an institution, are simply daubing their wall with untempered mortar, and constructing a refuge of lies which the great hail will ere long sweep away. Isa. xxviii, 17.

Preble.—"If, then, as the apostle says, '*Christ is the end of the law;*' and he having fulfilled a great part already, and the last to 'be fulfilled in the kingdom of God;' we see that the 'law' is not *all* fulfilled at one time; and that not until the heavens and the earth pass away! and hence, some fail entirely in the use they make of Matt. v, 17-19, in support of the perpetuity of the Sabbath. And to those who apply the 19th verse to such as observe the 'first day of the week' for the Sabbath, I would say, take heed and beware, or you, yourselves, may 'be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.'"

"What 'commandments' are 'these' which the Saviour speaks of in the 19th verse? Surely they must be '*these*' which he is presenting to his hearers in this discourse. And are they the commandments 'of old time?' or are they the 'commandments' of which he *himself* is the Author? The following, from this same discourse of our Saviour, will prove whether '*these least commandments*' are those of which the disciples had '*heard that it was said by them of old time;*'—or by the old dead 'schoolmaster;'—or whether they were '*these*' commandments put forth by the LIVING JESUS, in this emphatic language;—"BUT I SAY UNTO YOU," etc."

REPLY.—Eld. P. has repeatedly affirmed that the law, the whole law, is deceased, dead, passed away, because it has been fulfilled. But now he seems to have discovered that only a "great part already" is fulfilled, the rest to be accomplished in the future. Hence he has a little of it not fulfilled till the heavens and earth pass; and by adopting this new phase of interpretation he endeavors to save his theory from being completely overturned by Matt. v, 19. But he does not accomplish his purpose; for Christ does not say that till heaven and earth pass, all the law should not have passed, or only a great part should have been fulfilled; but till heaven and earth pass, *one jot* or *one tittle* shall in no wise pass from the law. Not the smallest fragment should pass from the law, or change take place in the law, till heaven and earth pass. But the great Teacher does not stop here. He adds, "till all things," as the Greek reads, "shall be fulfilled." All what things? The subject of discourse is the law and the prophets. The all things, therefore, must include all that the prophets have spoken; and we hear them saying in relation to the Sabbath, that, after the present heavens and earth have passed, it shall be observed from week to week, by all the redeemed hosts while the new heavens and the new earth remain! Isa. lvi, 23.

"What commandments are these?" asks Eld. P. "which the Saviour speaks of in the 19th verse?" And he then endeavors to fix the mind of the reader upon the words which Christ was about to utter as the ones meant by these commandments. Now it would be most natural to suppose that Christ would give his commandments first and annex his remarks and penalties afterward, instead of referring to them by such

expressions as "these commandments," as though the people were already familiar with them, when they were not yet given! But then, why should so small a matter as reversing the order of nature and common sense stand in the way of a theory!

To speak seriously, it will be evident to all who have not a predetermined view to maintain, that "these commandments" of which Christ speaks, are the commandments of the law to which he had just referred; and that was a law that had existed previous to his time, for he came not to destroy it. And we learn from verse 20, that it was the law of ten commandments; for it was the law which was the standard of righteousness, or right doing, or the rule of our life and actions; and that could be none other than the moral law of ten commandments.

Preble.—"Jesus speaks from 'a mountain'—hear him:—

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: *But I say unto you,* That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. *It hath been said,* Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: *But I say unto you,* that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery. Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: *But I say unto you,* swear not at all; nei-

ther by Heaven; for it is God's throne: nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: *but I say unto you,* that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. *But I say unto you,* love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect.'—Matt. v, 27-48.

"Here is a

"NEW CODE OF LAWS,

praise God, worth having—superior to those of the old dead 'schoolmaster'! This also puts to silence all cavil about the 'ten commandments,' or the decalogue, being superseded by the commandments or laws of Christ: for in this case there are at least two of the commandments of the decalogue especially referred to, viz.: the sixth and seventh—'Thou shalt not kill,' and 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.'

REPLY.—We have been patiently waiting for Eld. P.'s new code of laws. We have been fearing incessantly about the "new law of faith," "the law of Christ," the "law of the New Testament," &c. Now if such a code of laws exists in the place of the ten commandments, it devolves on Eld. P. to produce this code, to show us the laws contained under it, and the extent of their requirements or prohibitions. We know sin only by the demands of the law; for, says an apostle, writing to the Gentiles and for the benefit of Gentiles, "By the the law is the knowledge of sin;" and another apostle exclaims as late at least as the year A. D. 90, "Sin is the transgression of the law." Rom. iii, 20; 1 John iii, 4. Now what is sin, according to Eld. P.'s new law? Let him show us that law, or at once and forever abandon the idea. If such a law exists, it can and should be produced. Hence, as Eld. P. has grown rapturous over his new law, we have been waiting for him to produce that law, show of how many commandments it consists, tell us when it was enacted, by whom it was enacted, and how it came to take the place of the former ten commandments.

We have at last come to something which he calls a "New code of laws, praise God worth having," and "superior to those of the old dead school-master," or the ten commandments. As much as to say that those commandments which David pronounced "perfect converting the soul," were not worth having! But what is this "new code of laws?" Simply, some comments which the Saviour utters upon the traditions of the scribes and Pharisees, as relating to the ten commandments. A moment's consideration of the subject will make this apparent to the impartial reader.

1. Christ sets up the moral law, the ten commandments, as the great standard. He had not come to relax, abrogate, or annul it, and not a jot or tittle of it was to pass, as long at least, as the heavens and earth should stand. Matt. v, 17, 18.

2. He declared that whosoever should break, and teach men to break, one of the least of these commandments, even a jot or tittle, he should be called the least, or be of no esteem, or have no part in, the kingdom of Heaven. But whosoever should do and teach them, the same should be called great in the kingdom of Heaven. And let it be noticed that this blessing pronounced upon the doing and teaching of the least of these commandments, is introduced with the word therefore, showing it to be a conclusion from the preceding statement that not a jot or tittle of the law should pass, till all things should be fulfilled.

3. He arraigns the standard of the scribes and Pharisees before the standard of the ten commandments, in these words: For I say unto you that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Verse 20. He had just said that those who broke one of these least commandments, should not enter into the kingdom of Heaven. His charge therefore against the scribes and Pharisees was virtually that they had broken these commandments. But what was the matter with the scribes and Pharisees? They pretended to keep the commandments most strictly; how had they broken them? Answer. Just as he accused them on another occasion, Matt. xv, 6. "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by *your tradition*." Hence he goes on in Matt. v, to arraign their tradi-

tions, or their standard of righteousness, before the true standard of the law of ten commandments, tearing off from it their corruptions, and setting it forth in its true import and intent. The Jews, according to credible authors, had fallen into the error of teaching that the commandments only had reference to the outward acts: and that if, in this respect, a person's deportment was correct, the requirements of the law were sufficiently met, what ever might be the feelings, purposes, desires or passions of the heart. The Saviour lays bare the hypocrisy of such teaching by showing that the law of God has to do with the motives as well as the outward acts, and that it can be violated in spirit even though the letter remains unbroken. So we find that every principle laid down by him respecting murder, from verses 21-26, is included in the sixth commandment. All that is said from verse 27 to verse 32, is included in the seventh commandment. Verses 33-37 forbid an irreverent species of swearing, prevalent among the Jews, and coming under the head of the third commandment. And the remainder of the chapter is devoted to an exposition of the great principle on which one division of the law hangs, namely to love our neighbors as ourselves. Is there anything in this to show that the "ten commandments, or decalogue" were superseded by these words of our Lord? We are surprised that any person with a sane head and honest heart should make such a claim. Jesus is simply setting forth the extent of the principles of the ten commandments, showing how far the standard of the scribes and Pharisees fell below the true standard of the law of God.

So much on the meaning of this portion of scripture.

We must notice a fatal objection or two lying in the way of Eld. P.'s view.

1. If these sayings of Christ constitute, as he claims, a new code of laws, they were enacted some three years and a half before the old were abolished! No theory involving such a feature, is entitled to a moment's consideration.

2. What Eld. P. here calls his "new code of laws, praise God worth having," is very incomplete. There are, at most, but three of the ten commandments specifically referred to. Hence, according to his view, this "new code of laws," this "new law of faith," will permit us to have other gods before Jehovah, bow down and worship graven images, violate the Sabbath, dishonor our parents, steal, bear false witness, and covet. Is this a complete and perfect law? But perhaps Eld. P. will say, This is not all the code. Why then did he not call it only *part* of a code instead of a "new code, praise God worth having?" But if this is only a part of the new code, where is the rest of it? and when, where, and under what circumstances was it enacted? The opposers of the ten commandments are called upon to produce their "code." The view we advocate, that Christ in Matt. v. is simply commenting on the commandments, and, after affirming in the strongest terms, the perpetuity of the whole code, refers to those on which the Jews were especially guilty, makes all harmonious and plain.

We have already referred to the claim that all our duty is enjoined in the New Testament, as Fallacy No. 1, into which Eld. P. had fallen; and we promised to speak of it again. As we have now reached the only place where Eld. P. endeavors to collect his new code of laws, meagre as it is, this is the proper place to in-

roduce it. We affirm, then, that the New Testament is not the law-book of mankind; that there is no new principle of morality introduced therein, and not only so, but that the second commandment cannot therein be found; that is, there is no law in the New Testament to forbid our making graven images and bowing down to worship them.

Do you say the words of Christ forbid it in Matt. iv, 10, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve?" Then notice that these were the words of Christ to Satan; they are not a New-Testament law, but only a quotation from the Old, introduced by the expression, "*It is written.*"

Do you say again that we are exhorted to flee from idolatry, 1 Cor. x. 14? What is idolatry? If the New Testament contains the law for its prohibition, the New Testament must also define it; but the only definition we have of it in the New Testament is, that *covetousness* is idolatry. Col. iii, 5. Nothing here certainly to forbid graven images. Do you say then, that we must go to the Old-Testament law for the definition, then we reply, we must go there also for the prohibition; for the law that is sufficiently in force to define a sin, is sufficiently in force also to prohibit it.

We repeat, then, There is no law in the New Testament to forbid the formation or worship of graven images; and you who are teaching that all law is abolished but the New Testament, are practically, we do not say intentionally, breaking down the barrier and opening the way, to one of the most heinous sins against the Lord Jehovah.

Again, how will you prove from the New Testament that a man may not marry his sister or any one that is of near kin to him? Do you say that it is a spe-

cies of adultery? How do you know? The New Testament does not say so. Do you say that the common sense of mankind forbids it? Then you abandon your ground that the New Testament is a sufficient law, by making common sense come in to supply the lack. In the 18th of Leviticus we find full and explicit laws on this point. Do you say that these were given to the Jews alone? We reply that there is a moral principle involved therein, binding upon all other nations as well as the Jews, as we learn from the fact that this was among the abominations for which the Canaanites were destroyed out of the promised land, to make way for the children of Israel. Yet the New Testament has not a word to say about this sin. Let no more be said, therefore, about the laws of the New Testament "superseding" the morality of the Old, until it can be shown that no deficiency exists in what are called New Testament laws, either on the second commandment or the point now before us.

We would again remind the reader of the view which we hold to be truth, namely that the moral law has been brought over into the New Testament as a whole, and is binding in this dispensation in all its particulars, and to their fullest extent, reaching even to the thoughts and intents of the heart; and we ask him to consider whether such a position is not preferable to the views which Eld. P. has set forth.

Preble.—"If any one is disposed to think that the Lord Jesus Christ's laws, as found in the New Testament, are more lenient than those of the Old, let them take for an example what is said in the above quotation, and especially what is said in regard to the sin of 'adultery'; and they will find that THE NEW TESTAMENT LAWS ARE MORE STRICT THAN THOSE OF THE OLD: for the Lord Jesus Christ makes a man guilty of 'adultery' who shall even look on a woman to lust of-

ter her.' But says the cavalier, Christ let the woman go, who was taken in the very act of adultery, without condemning her. Without condemning her for what? I ask. He did not, to be sure, condemn her to 'be stoned,' as 'Moses in the law commanded,' for the sake of gratifying the woman's accusers—those old 'hypocrites'—who themselves were guilty of the double crime of, *first*, complicity with the woman; and *second*, of tempting Christ, that 'they might accuse him!' but he did condemn the woman as a sinner! and said, 'Go and SIN NO MORE?'"

REPLY.—The misapprehension under which Eld. P. labors in the remark that "the New Testament laws are more strict than those of the Old," is at once apparent, when we consider that what Christ says is only a comment on the moral laws of the Old Testament showing the extent of their principles, and the exceeding strictness of their requirements as already set forth. The trouble was here: The Pharisees had lowered the standard of the law, and by their traditions destroyed its spirit; and what Christ says, is not giving a new law, but simply stripping off the traditions of the Pharisees, and affirming the strictness of the Old. And we are sorry to see Eld. P. on this question arraying himself on the side of those hypocritical pharisees, instead of taking his stand with the "living Jesus."

Preble.—"DID THE LORD JESUS KEEP THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH? He evidently did, as he was 'made under the law' (Gal. iv. 4,) and was circumcised; he no doubt observed the Sabbath, as it ought to be observed at that time; although his manner of keeping it, however, was such that the old Pharisees accused him of breaking it, because he did not observe their traditions which they had connected with the observance of that day.

"There is no doubt but what the women mentioned

in Luke xxiii, 55, after they had 'prepared spices and ointments' for the body of Jesus, returned and 'rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment;' yea the 'fourth commandment.' Good, says the Sabbatarian. And I too say, Good; because I have no doubt but what it is true."

REPLY.—This is admission enough. If the women rested according to the fourth commandment, that commandment was still in force to require and regulate such rest. But this was the day following the crucifixion. Hence the fourth commandment was binding this side of the cross. And if it was in force one minute after the crucifixion, it is in force still; for there is no other point where its abolition can be claimed. Notice carefully this point. It is irrefragable evidence of the perpetuity of the Sabbath in this dispensation. Here the Sabbath stands, this side of the cross, observed by the personal and intimate disciples of Jesus, and that, too, according to the fourth commandment! All this Eld. P. admits. Here truth mightily entrenches itself. Let the opponent dislodge it if he can. But if he cannot, let him be careful to see to it, that he, too, rests on the Sabbath day "according to the commandment."

Preble.—"But when this matter shall be critically examined, I think all candid minds will acknowledge that this was

"THE LAST SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH EVER KEPT ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT, as I believe the following facts will abundantly prove. The original Greek words for Sabbath, as found in the New Testament, in their singular and plural form, are *Sabbaton*, and *Sabbata*. The number of times these words occur in the N. T. is sixty-eight. They are found in different books as follows: in Matt., eleven times; in Mark, twelve times; in Luke, twenty times; in John thirteen times; in Acts, ten times; in 1 Cor., once; and in

Col., *once*. These words are *transposed* (not translated) into our English version, in all, *fifty-nine* times; and thus called Sabbath, or Sabbath days, etc. But for some cause unknown to me, the translators saw fit to render the word *Sabbaton*, by the word '*week*' in *nine* cases out of the whole number *sixty-eight*! and these *nine* cases are found in the following places; in Matt xxviii, 1; Mark xvi, 2, 9; Luke xviii, 12; xxiv, 1; John xx, 1, 19; Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 2. In Matthew it reads,—"In the end of the Sabbath (*Sabbaton*) as it began to dawn toward the first (*day*, is a word supplied by the translators) of the *week* (*Sabbaton*), came Mary," etc. In Mark: "And very early in the morning, the first of the *week* (*Sabbaton*), they came," etc. "Now when Jesus was risen early the first of the *week* (*Sabbaton*), he appeared," etc. In Luke: "I fast twice in the *week* (*Sabbaton*), I give tithes," etc. "Now upon the first of the *week* (*Sabbaton*), very early in the morning," etc. In John: "The first of the *week* (*Sabbaton*), cometh Mary Magdalene early," etc. "Then the same day, at evening, being the first of the *week* (*Sabbaton*), when the doors were shut," etc. In Acts: "And upon the first of the *week* (*Sabbaton*), when the disciples came together to break bread," etc. In 1 Cor.: "Upon the first of the *week* (*Sabbaton*) let every one of you lay by him in store," etc.

"Now let us turn back to Matt. xxviii, 1, and see if we can ascertain the true import of this word '*week*,' as it has been thus found in the cases above referred to. It appears that the word *Sabbaton*, as found in this verse, occurs twice and in both instances it is in the plural form; and this being the case, the true rendering of the passage requires us to read it in substance, like this:—At the end of Sabbaths, in the beginning of the first of Sabbaths, etc. Or as Mark has it:—And very early in the first of Sabbaths (*lit.* of one of Sabbaths), etc. But Luke and John appear to have it still stronger:—And in the first of the Sabbaths, etc; the definite article the being placed before the name *Sabbaton*. Now it is evident that if the translators had just transposed the word *Sabbaton*, in these *nine* cases just examined, as they did in the other *fifty-nine* in-

stances already above referred to, then we should have had clear, blazing light shining on this glorious subject; and we should see that, *at the end of the seventh-day Sabbaths*—(or at the end of the Lord JEHOVAH'S Sabbaths—which he gave to the '*children of Israel*,' to be a '*sign*' unto them '*throughout their generations*') *THERE would be the BEGINNING of the LORD JESUS CHRIST'S SABBATHS*. Or, in other words, where one series of Sabbaths ended, there another series of Sabbaths began. And this change of Sabbaths was marked by the most important events that ever transpired in the history of man. "The veil of the temple was rent in twain"—"the middle wall of partition" between Jews and Gentiles was '*broken down*,' and thus they were '*made both one*.' "Our Saviour Jesus Christ" had '*abolished death*,' and had brought LIFE and IMMORTALITY to light through the gospel!—the saints were begotten again unto a lively hope by the RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST FROM THE DEAD!—the LIVING JESUS WAS VICTOR OVER 'DEATH' and the 'GRAVE'—*old things had passed away, BEHOLD, ALL THINGS HAD BECOME NEW.*"

REPLY.—In commenting upon the term "Lord's day" in Rev. i, 10, Eld. P. exclaimed, "Here shines the clear, blazing light of the Christian Sabbath." But Eld. P. seems to be somewhat in the condition of Cicero in relation to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Cicero acknowledged that he was persuaded of the truth of his position only while arguing in its favor. So Eld. P., having left the argument on Lord's day, the "blazing light" of that position seems to have faded even from his own mind; for we find him now exclaiming that "if the translators had just transposed" (does he not mean *transferred*?) "the word *Sabbaton*," in the nine cases where it is rendered week in the New Testament, "then we should have had clear, blazing light shining on this glorious subject." So, then, the "clear, blazing light" on the Sunday Sabbath lies in

the fact that the word *sabbaton* is incorrectly translated week, nine times in the New Testament! And Eld. P. takes it upon himself to correct the translation, and bring out the blazing light! We are glad the controversy is narrowed down to this point. If left here it would soon be disposed of; for it will not take long to sweep this objection back into the depths of night from whence it sprung.

But as we see Eld. P. so entangled in the Greek, we cannot help inquiring where he has been the past fifteen years, during which time the Sabbath question has been especially agitated, and the point here brought up, been under frequent discussion. Could none of his brethren help him here? We might refer him to J. Litch, present editor of the *Advent Herald*, whose experience has been such as to at least qualify him to give to those who think of arraying the Greek on the Sunday side of this question, just the information that they need; also to what the late S. Bliss, former editor of the *Herald*, has written upon it; and to an article from Prof. N. N. Whiting, of Williamsburg, N. Y., published in the *Voice of the Prophets*, as late as September, 1863.

It is a fact that the word *sabbaton* is rendered week, in the nine instances Eld. P. has referred to. Is this rendering correct? "For some cause *unknown to me*," says he, "the translators saw fit to render the word *sabbaton* by the word week in nine cases out of the whole number sixty-eight." The translators certainly had a reason for translating it as they have done; and we can tell Eld. P. how he might have "known" what it was. It is to be presumed that he possesses a copy of the common edition of Greenfield's Greek Testament. If he will look in the lexicon attached to that Testa-

ment, under the word *sabbaton*, he will find the third definition reading like this: "A period of seven days, a week." If this word in certain relations means week, it is certainly proper so to translate it. And one of the instances to which Eld. P. has referred, renders it necessary to good sense to give it this meaning: Luke xviii, 12. "I fast twice in the week" (*sabbaton*). Now if the word here means the Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, and not the whole week, we have the singular spectacle of the old Pharisee claiming to fast twice in a day of twenty-four hours, which would be, of course, between meals! Bloomfield, in his note on this place, says that this fast was on the second and fifth days of the week, according to Epiphanius and the Rabbins. Robinson, under the word *sabbaton*, says, "2. Meton, a *sabbath*, put for the interval from Sabbath to Sabbath, hence a *se'nnight, week*."

As we have referred to the testimony of the late S. Bliss, we will give a paragraph from his pen on this point. In the *Advent Herald* of July 16, 1851, almost thirteen years ago, J. Litch wrote a short article on the Sabbath, using the Greek exactly as Eld. P. has used it in the article before us. S. Bliss, then editor of the *Herald*, and also a zealous first-day Adventist, appended a few remarks to Litch's article, completely exposing the fallacy of his criticism upon the Greek. Considering his views and position, this must be taken as a fair and honest comment upon the meaning of the Greek as touching the first day of the week, and should be authority with all first-day Adventists. After Eld. Litch had offered his criticism, stating that the phrase, first day of the week, should be rendered "one of Sabbaths," &c., exactly as Eld. P. affirms, Bliss appended to his article the following paragraph:

"REMARKS. Lest any should gather from the above that the word Sabbath is represented by the phrase, 'first day of the week,' we add that Sabbath is simply translated *week* in those texts—other words indicating the day of the week. The word Sabbath is originally a Hebrew word, and signifies rest; but occurring at regular intervals, by a metonymy it became significant of the period separated by these rests. So that we have the seventh day of the rest, and the first day of the rest, week, or Sabbath."

From the foregoing it is evident that the word *sabbaton* sometimes means the whole week. How, then, shall we determine *when* it has this meaning? Easily enough. Robinson says that it has this meaning "after numerals denoting the days of the week." We now inquire, Does the word *sabbaton*, in those places where the expression, "first day of the week," occurs in the New Testament, follow a numeral adjective denoting the day of the week? We answer, Yes, *in every instance*. Then no one can deny, without discarding all authority, that in these instances *sabbaton* means week, and the translation of our common version is correct. The numeral adjective used in Matt. xxviii, 1; Mark xvi, 2; Luke xxiv, 1; John xx, 1, 19; Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 2, is *μία* or *μια*; in Mark xvi, 9, *πρωτη*. One instance will suffice for the whole, and we will take the first one, Matt. xxviii, 1. The words are, *μια σαββατον* (pronounced with long o, as in tone). *Μια* is the numeral adjective meaning one, or according to a Hebrewism, "first." It agrees with day, understood. *Σαββατον* is in the genitive plural, literally answering to the English words, "of the week." So we have, as plainly as language can say it, "first day of the week."

Eld. P. argues, however, that here the Lord Jeho-

vah's Sabbaths ceased, and the Lord Jesus Christ's Sabbaths were introduced, or one series of Sabbaths there ended, and another series of Sabbaths there began. But this little shift in favor of Sunday, involves a fatal violation of grammar which he has apparently overlooked. If his rendering is correct, and first day of the week should be rendered, "one of Sabbaths," meaning one of a new series of Sabbaths then introduced, then the word one, *mian*, must agree with *sabbaton* understood. But *sabbaton* is neuter, and *mian* is feminine. Grammar will not submit to any such treatment as this. The word *mian* being in the feminine gender shows that the noun understood, with which it agrees, is a feminine noun. And there is no word which can be introduced to supply the ellipsis, except the word which the translators of our Bible have supplied, namely, *heemeran*, day, which renders the sense complete, and being a feminine noun, answers to the feminine adjective, *mian*, and makes the construction harmonious and perfect. We accordingly find in the margin of the Greek Testament, a reference from the word *mian*, saying, "*Heemeran* understood." And we are forced to the conclusion that Greenfield, Robinson, and Liddell and Scott, in their lexicons, and the forty-seven learned men of England who made our version of the New Testament, are correct in their translation, and Eld. P. is wrong. Another conclusion is no less apparent, namely, that this great "blaze" of "light," with which Eld. P. hoped to dazzle us from the Greek, has proved but another *ignis fatuus*, which, after leading its victim into inextricable bogs, has—gone out!

And to conclude his extraordinary argument here, Eld. P. makes an application of 2 Cor. v, 17, "All things are become *new*!" The apostle is careful to

qualify his language thus: "*If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, old things are passed away; behold all things are become new.*" But how if a man is *not* in Christ? He certainly is not a new creature; to *him* old things are not passed away, neither have all things become new. So according to Eld. P. this new Sabbath is only for those who are in Christ, or who have been converted! and he who is not converted is still under the old dispensation; for there is nothing new to him, according to Paul. Our opponents will certainly add nothing to their cause, by applying to the change of dispensations, language which was spoken exclusively of conversion!

Preble.—"One confirmation of this truth, that the seventh-day Sabbath was to cease at the resurrection of our Lord from the dead, is the fact, that out of the whole number of times the Sabbath is mentioned in the New Testament, it is never spoken of by either Christ or any of the apostles as a precept, or command; but it is only spoken of as an *historical* fact. And it is thus worthy of special attention that, whenever the seventh-day Sabbath is mentioned in the New Testament, it is always to be found in the five *historical books*; and *never* *once* found in the *epistles* of any of the apostles. And hence, as I have before stated, so I again repeat, that in no instance is the Sabbath spoken of by either Christ or his apostles as a command or precept. I know that our Saviour said that he was 'Lord of the Sabbath day'; and this shows that he had the power to *change it* whenever he pleased."

REPLY.—"The seventh-day Sabbath," says Eld. P., "was to cease at the resurrection of our Lord from the dead." Where is his proof for this? Nothing ceased at the resurrection. Nothing was to cease there. Everything that was to cease ceased at the cross. Eld. P. now has three places where the Sabbath has been

abolished: first, in the time of John. The "old school-master then and there deceased," he has told us. 2. With Christ. Christ is the end of the law, and 3. He now places the cessation of the Sabbath at the resurrection. Were it not merely to gratify curiosity, we would like to inquire which of these points he considers best established.

But it is not difficult to divine why Eld. P. wishes to place the dividing point on the Sabbath question at the resurrection. He knows, and has admitted, that the holy women, this side of the cross, kept the Sabbath, and that, too, according to the fourth commandment.

But Eld. P. endeavors to find an objection against the Sabbath in the assertion that it is never spoken of by Christ or his apostles as a precept or command. We wonder if they ever spoke of Sunday-keeping as a precept or command, or even in any other manner whatever. Eld. P. will do well to be careful lest in his endeavors to overthrow our theory he demolishes his own.

But again. The Sabbath, says Eld. P., "is only spoken of as a historical fact." Can as much even as this be said of Sunday? We answer, No. Not an instance can be found of a meeting in the day-time of the first day of the week, nor any evidence that any of the disciples attached any sort of sacredness to that day whatever. The Lord of the Sabbath never once took that day into his lips, and it is only once mentioned in the epistles, and then as a day for *secular business*!

But what are the historical facts relative to the Sabbath? We have the fact that the disciples kept the Sabbath this side of the cross according to the commandment; that the law containing the Sabbath has been brought over into this dispensation as a whole;

that Christ in the strongest terms enjoined obedience to it; that it was the "custom" and "manner" of Christ, and Paul, at least, to observe the Sabbath; and that throughout the book of Acts, which was written thirty years this side of the resurrection, the seventh day is uniformly called the Sabbath, and no other day is so named, thus recognizing the existence of that institution in this dispensation in the clearest manner. Suppose, then, that the Sabbath is mentioned only historically, such historical facts as these cannot be ignored, and they settle the whole question, they cover the whole ground, and are all that the most fervent lover of the Sabbath could desire.

But Eld. P. continues, that Christ's being Lord of the Sabbath shows that he had power to change it whenever he pleased. We deny that the language teaches, or was designed to teach, any such thing. But suppose it does teach that? What of it? Suppose five hundred testimonies could be produced showing that Christ had power to change the Sabbath, what would be proved by it? We ask our opponents to just put their finger on the testimony which says that he *has done* it. And until they can do this, all their inferences that he has *power* to do it, prove nothing, and amount to nothing.

Proble.—"It is true, that in the Acts of the apostles we find mention made of the apostle Paul speaking to the Jews in their synagogues on the Sabbath; but never do we find any of the other apostles holding meetings on the seventh-day Sabbath. And there is but *one single instance* where we have an account of any of the apostles holding a meeting on that day, which appears to have been for a season of mutual worship among themselves; and that is the one mentioned in Acts xvi, 13, where it is said:—'And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer

was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither.'"

REPLY.—And on the first day of the week we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made. Hold! It does not read so. We were imagining how it would sound, could any such testimony be found in reference to Sunday, and what infinite consolation its observers would derive from that fact. But though they may weep for it, even as Rachel wept for her children still it "is not." We do have this testimony, however, relative to the Sabbath; and the expression, "where prayer was wont to be made," denotes that this observance was *customary*. And Eld. P. moreover, has admitted that this "appears to have been for a season of mutual worship among themselves," that is, among Christians. And where was this customary Sabbath assemblage? not in Jerusalem; not in Judea, but nearly fifteen degrees to the westward, in Philippi, then chief city of Macedonia. Do you ask for apostolic practice? Here then you have it.

Eld. P. does not attempt to dispose of this "historical" fact relative to the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath, but he does attempt to detract from its importance by styling it "but *one single instance*." Very well: can even "one single instance" be found of the observance of Sunday as a day devoted to religious rest and worship? We answer, No; and shall presently prove it. Then this instance is certainly entitled to some weight, as by it, we have at least *one* statement of the customary observance of the Sabbath by the early Christians, against *nothing* for Sunday; and one against nothing, though not a numerous, is yet an overwhelming, majority.

Preble.—"The passage in 17th chapter of Acts 2d verse, where it is said: 'And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them *out of the Scriptures*'; only shows that Paul was in Thessalonica, in a Jewish 'synagogue,' and his 'manner was,' when he could get an opportunity, he would 'reason with *them out of the Scriptures*; opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and although they were ever so much offended with him, he would 'preach unto *them* 'that this Jesus' 'is Christ.' And the apostle's 'manner,' in thus going into Jewish synagogues on the Sabbath, was very much like my 'manner' when I believed in the seventh-day Sabbath; for I attended a great many more meetings on the '*first day of the week*,' than on any other, for the very good reason, that it was much easier to get the people out to meeting on this day than the day that I then believed was the Sabbath."

REPLY.—This is the uniform and stereotyped method of accounting for Paul's practice of preaching on the Sabbath. Now if we can find instances of Paul's thus observing the Sabbath where this reason could not apply, will our opponents admit that the ground of their objection here is not valid, but that Paul's course touching the Sabbath was not because he could meet a congregation of Jews upon that day, but out of the regard he had for it as the still living and holy rest-day of the Lord Jehovah? The candid certainly will. We have already had before us the testimony concerning the customary meeting by the river side at Philippi, which Eld. P. has admitted appears to have been for a season of mutual worship among 'hemselves.'

But we will not further press this testimony as we have something still better. It is found in Acts xiii. In verse 14, we read that Paul and his company departed from Perga, and came to Antioch in Pisidia,

and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and sat down. Then follows the discourse that Paul delivered to the people, till verse 42, where we read, "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the *next Sabbath*." Verse 44. "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." To these facts we call the careful attention of the reader. We learn here that by the word Sabbath in Acts is meant the day upon which the Jews assembled in the synagogue for worship. And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the *Gentiles*, not the Jews, besought Paul to speak the same words to them the next Sabbath. And lest any should be confused by the marginal reading, which is, in the week between or in the Sabbath between, we introduce the following note from Dr. Bloomfield on this verse: "The words *εις το μεταξυ σαββ.* are by many commentators supposed to mean 'on some intermediate week day.' But that is refuted by verse 44, and the sense expressed in our common version is, no doubt, the true one. It is adopted by the best recent commentators, and confirmed by the ancient versions." This second meeting then was called at the request of the Gentiles, was for the benefit of Gentiles, and was almost exclusively composed of Gentiles, yet it was delayed till the next Sabbath. Why was this? Answer. It was because the Gentiles well understood that Paul, though a Christian apostle, regarded the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord, as the only regular weekly period for divine worship.

But suppose now for a moment, that Paul believed the Sabbath had been changed to the *first day of the week*; that Sunday was the Christian Sabbath, which

he, as a teacher of Christianity, was bound to promulgate and support; when the Gentiles, who would not, of course, be influenced by any purely Jewish customs, besought him to preach to them the next Sabbath, would he not have immediately told them that they need not wait till another Jewish Sabbath came round, but that the next day, the first day of the week, Sunday, was the Christian Sabbath, and on that day they might come out and hear the words of life? He most assuredly would, as no man can deny. And the fact that he did not make any such mention of a first-day Sabbath on this occasion, which was some fourteen years after the resurrection of Christ, shews positively that up to that time he had no knowledge of any such Sabbath; nor had Luke learned of any such change of the Sabbath, when he wrote the Acts, *thirty* years this side of the resurrection.

Three points are established by this "historical" record, concerning the Sabbath: 1. That Paul so late as the year A. D. 45, knew nothing of a first-day Sabbath; but 2. That he did regard the seventh-day Sabbath as the day still to be employed in divine worship; and 3. That he did not do this because he could gain a Jewish audience on that day; for his discourse was for the Gentiles; but to show his regard for the day as still the divinely appointed Sabbath of the Lord; and to impress upon his Gentile hearers the same truth. Let those who believe in a change of the Sabbath, study well this incident in the life of Paul, in all its bearings.

Preble.—"In Acts xviii, 4, it is said, 'And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks.' Where was Paul at the time? At 'Corinth.' Who was he with? He was

with a '*Jew* named Aquila,' and 'his wife Priscilla.' 'And because he was of the same craft, he abode with them and wrought (for by their occupation they were tent-makers). And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and *persuaded the Jews and the Greeks.* And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in spirit, and testified to the *Jews* that Jesus was Christ. And when *they opposed themselves, and blasphemed*, he shook his raiment, and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: *from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles.*' Acts xviii, 1-6.

"The apostle did not find this very pleasant 'seventh-day' worship, did he? These were not his *brethren* that Paul was with on this occasion, were they? 'And when they *opposed themselves, and blasphemed,*' Paul left them, saying, '*From henceforth I will go to the GENTILES.*' Do we have any account that the apostle after this had any more meetings on the *seventh-day Sabbath*? Never! This was the last. But we do find him holding meetings with his *brethren* after this; but *their* meetings for worship were on the '*first day of the week.*' (*Sabbaton.*) Acts xx, 7."

REPLY.—"He reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath." This is spoken of the seventh day of the week; and it is here called, as in many other places in the Acts, *the Sabbath*, without any limitation or qualification. The book of Acts was written thirty years, at least, this side of the resurrection. It was written by a Christian, and for the benefit of Christians in this dispensation. The seventh day either was or was not the Sabbath, at the time Luke wrote. If it was not, how shall we account for his frequent and familiar mention of it in this manner? Would he, writing for Christians in this dispensation, continually call a day the Sabbath which he knew had been abolished, and was not to be kept by Christians under the gospel? Could he say of anything that was done on the seventh

day, that it was done on the Sabbath, as he repeatedly does, if the Sabbath had been done away, or if any other day had taken the place of the seventh? Impossible. It would not be in accordance either with his character as a Christian writer, or with strict principles of morality. Such mention of the Sabbath in Acts can in no way be accounted for, except upon the ground that it is still binding in this dispensation.

When Paul was at Corinth he declared to the blaspheming Jews, that he would go to the Gentiles. Then asks Eld. P., "Do we have any account that the apostle after this had any more meetings on the *seventh-day Sabbath*? Never." Wait a moment. Was this the first time that he had declared that he turned to the Gentiles? By no means. Nine years before this, when Paul was at Antioch in Pisidia, as already noticed, Acts xiii, 14, 42, 44, 46, he declared that he turned to the Gentiles. When the Gentiles had besought him to preach to them the next Sabbath, and when, accordingly, almost the whole city had come together, the Jews, seeing the multitudes were filled with envy, and "spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and *blaspheming*." Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold and said, "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you, but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, *lo, we turn to the Gentiles*." When was this? At the commencement of that meeting for which the Gentiles had waited a whole week in order that it might be held on the Sabbath, and for which Paul had suffered them to wait, under the impression that that was the proper day for divine worship; and so, having turned to the Gentiles, Paul continued his discourse to them on

the Sabbath, never intimating to them any such thing as the abolition of the institution or the change of the day. Here was just as definite a turning to the Gentiles as the case mentioned by Eld. P. from Acts xviii, and now we will inquire, Do we find the apostle after this holding "meetings upon the seventh-day Sabbath?" Surely we do. It was after this that the apostles went out by the river side at Philippi for a season of social worship among Christians, as already referred to, Acts xvi; after this that meetings were held at Thessalonica three Sabbath-days, Acts xvii, 2; after this that Paul reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath at Corinth, Acts xviii, and when he was driven from thence, entered into a man's house, named Justus, whose house joined hard to the synagogue, and continued there a year and six months teaching the word of God among them."

From all this, it is apparent that Paul's turning to the Gentiles did not in the least affect his practice relative to the Sabbath; but as Eld. P. has asserted with great assurance that his observance of the Sabbath at Corinth just before turning to the Gentiles "was the last," we cannot forbear noticing one more incident in the life of Paul. Two years after this, Paul visited Ephesus, as recorded in Acts xix, 8, and went into the *synagogue* and spake boldly for the space of three months. On what day may we suppose that he held meetings in the synagogue at Ephesus? Heretofore such meetings have uniformly been held on the Sabbath; but now we must conclude, must we not, of course, that *these* meetings were held on the first day; that Paul procured the Jewish synagogue for his Sunday services! Verily Eld. P. has here sailed clear up on to dry ground.

Referring to the opposition of the Jews, he asks, "Paul did not find this very pleasant seventh-day worship, did he?" To which we reply that Paul did not keep the Sabbath, or perform any other Christian duty because it was *pleasant* so far as his relation with the world or unbelieving professors was concerned; and if the principle involved in his question is the one upon which Eld. P. acted, during the short time in which he walked in obedience to the truth, we marvel not that he so soon turned his back upon the cross-bearing way. It would be well if he had adhered to the sentiment he expressed in his tract written in 1845 in honor and vindication of the Sabbath, p. 12: "But for one, I had rather obey God, and have his approbation here, and finally enjoy the blessings of the new earth—though all men hate me—than to have the good opinion of men here, and perish at last. Or in other words, and in the language of another, 'I had rather go Heaven alone, than to hell with the multitude.'"

Continuing with Paul, after his meeting at Corinth, he says, "But we do find him holding meetings with his brethren after this; but *their* meetings for worship were on the first day of the week (*sabbaton*). Acts xx, 7." As this is the most specious and insidious portion of the last quotation from Eld. P., and as Acts xx, 7, is the only mention in the New Testament of any religious meeting of whatever kind, on the first day of the week, night or day, it is perhaps entitled to more than a passing notice. Eld. P.'s assertion that Paul held no more meetings on the seventh day, after turning to the Gentiles, we have already followed into the ground; and we shall find his assertion or insinuation, that the first day was thereafter devoted by the disciples to religious worship, equally false.

Acts xx, 7, records a solitary instance of a meeting on the first day of the week. Let us look at this meeting, and see in what part of the day it was held, what portion it occupied, what it determines respecting the day on which it occurred, and how the disciples spent the remainder of the day. In verse 8 we read, "And there were *many lights* in the upper chamber where they were gathered together." Now it does not particularly concern us to know just how many lamps were burning on that occasion, and we are not told; but it does seem that the Holy Spirit has caused this particular to be recorded to show us that this was an evening meeting. And if Eld. P. had looked at this meeting in the light of these lamps, we think he would have arrived at more correct conclusions concerning it.

This one point is then settled: the meeting was an evening meeting, held *not* in the day-time, but in the evening of the first day of the week. Now in what part of the first day did the evening come? In the first part, or the last part? Answer. In the first part; as according to Bible reckoning, a reckoning by which Paul and the disciples were governed, the evening was the first portion of the day. "The evening and the morning were the first day." Gen. i. And so of the second, and third days, and so on. Again, "From even to even shall ye celebrate your sabbaths." Lev. xxiii, 32. So that the first day of the week in Paul's time commenced with what would be, according to the present reckoning of time, Saturday evening; and consequently that meeting at Troas was held on what would now be Saturday night! Mark this. And that you may not think this is any fancy of our own, we will give a few quotations from standard authorities sustaining this point:

Prof. Hacket comments upon this text thus: "The

Jews reckoned the day from evening to morning, and on that principle the evening of the first day of the week would be our Saturday evening." Kitto, whose *Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature* has hitherto been a standard work with scholars, in noting the fact that this meeting at Troas was an evening meeting, speaks thus: "It has from this last circumstance been inferred that the assembly commenced after sunset on the Sabbath, at which hour the first day of the week had commenced according to the Jewish reckoning [Jahn *Bibl. Antiq.* § 398], which would hardly agree with the idea of a commemoration of the resurrection." *Cyclopedia*, article, *Lord's Day*. And Prynne, in his Dissertation on the Lord's Day Sabbath, thus states this point: "Because the text saith there were many lights in the upper room where they were gathered together, and that Paul preached till midnight, . . . this meeting of the disciples at Troas began at evening. The sole doubt will be what evening this was. For my own part I conceive clearly that it was upon Saturday night, as we falsely call it, and not the coming Sunday night. . . . Because St. Luke records that it was upon the first day of the week, when this meeting was, therefore it must needs be on the Saturday, not on our Sunday evening, since Sunday evening in St. Luke's and the Scripture account was no part of the first, but of the second, day; the day ever beginning and ending at evening."

In view of such testimony as above quoted, no one certainly will endeavor to controvert the fact that this meeting was upon the evening preceeding the day-time of the first day of the week. Paul preached till midnight, healed the young man who fell from the window, continued his speech till break of day, verse 11, and

when Sunday had fairly and broadly dawned upon the world, what did he do? Spend the rest of the day in religious abstinence from labor, and hold a forenoon and afternoon meeting with the disciples there? Nothing of the kind. But, continues the record, "*so he departed.*" Off he went, Sunday morning, with the rest of his company, on his long journey up to Jerusalem, he going afoot, verse 13, a singular way to keep Sunday, if it was the Sabbath, and the rest sailing around to Assos, there intending to take him in. Now if Paul's meeting with the disciples in the evening, at the commencement of that first day, imparted any sort of sanctity whatever to the day, his traveling on the latter part, and all the light part of the day, more than took off that sanctity. And as this was his last act on that day, such is the apostolic example he bequeathed to posterity touching the first day of the week.

It was in this same year, A. D. 59, that Paul gave instruction to the church at Corinth, as he had before to the churches of Galatia, to lay by them in store upon the first day of the week, for purposes of religious charity, directions which involve the necessity of reviewing their secular business, counting up their worldly gains, to see to what extent the Lord had prospered them, and determining what part they could devote to the wants of their brethren; work which would well commence the secular business of the week, but would be wholly inadmissible for the Sabbath, which is to be devoted to religious rest and worship, and a scrupulous dismissal of all worldly cares and considerations.

If any should say that the language, "lay by him in store," means a collection in the public congregation, and that therefore meetings must have been regularly held on the first day of the week, we reply that the

original will not admit of any such idea. The Greek of the expression is *παρ' εαυτω*; and Greenfield in his lexicon translates these words thus: "with one's self; that is, *at home*." From this it is apparent that what Paul here commanded was a private transaction, to be accomplished by each one at home, and not involving the idea of a public meeting at all.

For a more extended examination of this text, and the meaning of the phrase, "lay by him in store," in twelve translations, and nine different languages, we refer the reader to the History of the Sabbath, pp. 175-178. Space forbids us longer to dwell upon it here.

We submit our proposition, then, as proved, that there is no instance of a meeting held in the day-time of the first day of the week, nor held upon it at all as the regular day for divine worship, nor a single mention of it in the New Testament, as any other than a secular day. In distinction from this we have the Sabbath, everywhere in the history of the early church, as contained in the Acts of the Apostles, spoken of as the regular day for religious meetings, not for the Jews only, but for the Gentiles also.

We have up to this point given from Eld. P. what constituted three of his articles in the World's Crisis, numbered one, two, and three, respectively, each paper containing an entire number; number one being in one paper, number two in another, and number three in another. To his third article he appended the following postscript:

"P. S. When I sent my second No., I was in hopes I could close my argument on this subject with this No.; but I am unable to do it without making my article too lengthy for one paper. Hope the readers of the Crisis will have patience with me, and I will close with my next."

Expecting, as would naturally be inferred from this postscript, that one more number completed as each of the other numbers had been, in one paper, would finish up Eld. P.'s series of articles against the Sabbath, we at this point, commenced the Review of them, without waiting for the appearance of the next article here promised, which would be number four. When we commenced the review, we promised to give his articles entire, as the reader will see by referring to the first part of this work. In thus commencing a reply to a series of articles before seeing their conclusion, so far as any argument was concerned, we were safe enough, as we would just as soon guarantee to answer an argument against the Sabbath before seeing it, as afterward; on the same ground that our preachers, knowing every turn that the advocates of the first-day Sabbath can take, can with great precision, and frequently do, *review* sermons on that subject before they are delivered. But as regards the length of the articles which we thus bound ourselves to publish, subsequent events proved that we had greatly miscalculated. After a lapse of some weeks, "number four" appeared, but at its close we found "To be continued." Another paper appeared, and still it was continued; and still another in which it was concluded. Thus number four occupied three papers, and covered as much space as all three of the preceding numbers put together; and so it proved that of the articles of which we supposed we had seen three-quarters, at the time we commenced our reply, we had seen only one-half. We state these facts as an apology to the reader for the unexpected length to which we thus find ourselves under the necessity of drawing out this review.

To this we must add a few remarks more, lest the

reader should get a wrong impression concerning Eld. P. in this connection. From the facts as thus presented, it would almost appear that Eld. P., taking advantage of our promise to publish his articles entire, resolved to make the most of his privilege, and so designedly drew out his articles to an unnatural length. It so appeared to us, till we received from him a letter stating the following facts, which entirely clear him from any such motive in the matter, and which we deem it justice to him to state: 1. The delay of several weeks in his articles, after we commenced our review, was made at the Office of the Crisis, not by Eld. P. 2. His entire article was written and sent to the Crisis Office before our reply was commenced.

There is another item which should be brought into this digression, at this point. Eld. P., for some reason, seems not to be well pleased with the manner in which this controversy is proceeding, and hence, under date of May 13, 1864, he sent to this office the following letter, which, as it was superscribed "For the Review," will be most appropriately presented in this connection:

"BOTH SIDES OF THE SABBATH QUESTION."

"BRO. WHITE: I notice in this week's Review, that you have expressed the opinion that Bro. Smith is 'now about half through' with his 'review' of my articles on the Sabbath question, as recently published in the Crisis.

"I also notice that it is your opinion that 'both sides will make a splendid book on the question of the Sabbath and Law of about two hundred and twenty-five pages, which will be ready in a few weeks,'

"From the above, I conclude you expect to end 'both sides' as soon as Bro. S. finishes his 'review' of

what I have already written. But I hope this will not be so, as I trust you will be liberal enough to give me the privilege of correcting some mistakes which Bro. S. has committed thus far; and others, if he should commit more.

"And I am quite sure of one thing; if there is not a little more caution exercised, and less errors committed in the review of the remainder of my argument, than there has been thus far, the 'book' will hardly be 'ready in a few weeks,' or 'two hundred and twenty-five pages,' contain all that may be said on 'both sides' of the question; that is, if I am permitted to speak for myself, so that I shall be fairly represented before the readers of the Review.

"What say, Bro. White; do you intend I shall have a fair opportunity through your columns to review my Reviewer? and so correct some of the errors and misrepresentations which may be committed in Bro. Smith's review of my argument? I shall expect this privilege, and I do not know as I have any just reason to doubt but I shall be permitted to do so.

"T. M. PREBLE.

"East Weare, N. H., May 13, 1864."

To this letter we have but a few words of reply to make.

1. We have placed ourselves under no obligations to Eld. P. by reviewing his articles. In a world like this, where the advocates of almost every species of error, compared with the advocates of truth, are more than one hundred to one, truth would stand a poor chance, if, every time she arose to defend herself against the attacks of opponents, she thereby placed herself under obligation to them to continue the controversy as long as their prejudice or passion might dictate.

2. In regard to the "misrepresentations" of which Eld. P. complains, we took the precaution to fully guard against any such charge, by giving his articles entire. We give them word for word, italics, quotation marks, and all, just as he published them; not a quotation is garbled, changed or condensed; and if we do not faithfully represent his arguments, can not the reader, with both sides before him, discern it? We fail to see the need of such manifest sensitiveness here. Belief on either side cannot be compelled. Much must be left to the judgment and discernment of the reader.

3. These articles of Eld. P.'s were not called forth by any attack upon him. He voluntarily, we may presume, undertook to set before the people his side of the question. He has taken his own time for it, his own space, and his own manner, and been as thorough and minute as he pleased; and if his arguments are intrinsically sound, they will stand, and have their effect, however they may be treated. But if, upon their being reviewed, he finds that they are lacking in some of their essential features, a link gone here, and a length there, and he thinks he could do better upon a second trial, that is his concern, not ours. But

4. We have the following fair and liberal proposition to make. If the *World's Crisis*, in which Eld. P.'s articles originally appeared, will publish what we have written and shall write in reply, and will also give both sides of whatever future discussion there may be between us, on this subject, small as our paper is, its columns will be open to him on these terms, to any extent. We are sometimes accused of being uncharitable and exclusive. But we have yet to see, in any of the papers which raise this charge against us, a thor-

ough and connected article from any accredited writer on our side of the question, such as we are now giving from Eld. P. on theirs, and such as has frequently been given through the *Review* on both the no-sabbath and Sunday sides of this controversy. And to ask that our columns shall still be open while theirs remain closed, is asking that this inequality shall be continued. Whereas all that can justly be required of us, is that we shall be as liberal as they, conditions to which we will cheerfully accede.

We turn now to a consideration of Eld. P.'s "number four."

Preble.—"THE TWO COVENANTS.—'He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.' In confirmation of what has been already argued in relation to the old "law" being "done away," and with it the seventh-day Sabbath, I will present the following in regard to the "old" and "new" "covenant," which embrace the plan of salvation of a lost world. But in doing so I shall confine myself mostly to the epistle to the Hebrews, where we have presented to us the most perfect analysis of the two systems of the divine arrangement by which man may escape death and obtain eternal life. While treating upon the subject of the old and new covenants, the apostle says,—"For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." (vii, 12.) But as he labored to convince the Hebrews, or Jews, that their system of worship, or their "ordinances of divine service" (ix, 1) were only "imposed on them until the time of reformation" (ix, 10); and that now there had been "verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof" (vii, 18); and that they were now under "a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God" (iv, 14), "of whom—as he said—"we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing" (v, 11.) And it is the same with me now, I "have many things to say" on this glorious

subject, but they are 'hard to be uttered, seeing there are so many who 'are dull of hearing.' Yea, there are many now, as there were then, who love the teachings of the old dead 'schoolmaster' far better than that of the LIVING JESUS!"

REPLY. Eld. P. now sets out to confirm what he has "already argued in relation to the old law being done away," by showing that the old covenant has passed away. What he means by the old law is, the ten commandments. Now has the old covenant anything to do with the ten commandments; that is, does the passing away of the old covenant affect the existence of the ten commandments? Not unless the old covenant was the ten commandments. But this Eld. P. has not shown and can never show. He quotes Heb. vii, 12: "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." What law? That law, of course that regulated the priesthood. Is there anything about priesthood in the ten commandments? Not a word. What was the law concerning the priesthood? The next two verses to the one quoted read: "*For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.*" Here it is. The law concerning the priesthood was that the priests should be taken only from the tribe of Levi; but our Saviour was from another tribe; hence when God made him a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec, it is evident that he thereby changed or set aside that law which confined the priesthood to the tribe of Levi. Thus the priesthood being changed, there was of necessity a change also of the law; yet men with

a marvelous obtuseness, will quote this testimony to show that the ten commandments have been changed! and that the Sabbath has given place to Sunday!

There are other component parts of the old covenant brought to view in Eld. P.'s quotation, such as "their system of worship, 'ordinances of divine service,'" language which is never applied to the ten commandments; ordinances that were imposed on them only till the time of reformation; not the ten commandments; for they are moral, and are the very foundation of all reformation; but something which is declared to be weak and unprofitable. It would be blasphemy to apply such language as this to the ten commandments, the only document we have, which God ever wrote with his own finger. It is no wonder that David exclaimed with the deepest reverence in view of this fact, "The law of the Lord is perfect."

But in comes the "old dead 'schoolmaster'" again. This time Eld. P. applies it to the Jewish system of worship, their ordinances of divine service, the regulations of their priesthood, &c. Here to be sure he has stumbled into the truth; but he adds, "There are many now, as there were then, who love the teachings of the old dead 'schoolmaster' far better than that of the living Jesus," thereby insinuating again that we adopt all the typical services of the former dispensation. He might as well accuse of cannibalism; for all who know anything about us, know that it is no such thing; and those who do not, will not be foolish enough to believe it, even though a minister of the gospel be father of the charge.

Preble.—"I will now spend a few moments in turning to the Old Testament, in order to prove that the old 'covenant' referred to was that which was written on

'two tables of stone,' and that only. And if this is found to be really true, it will furnish an argument which will overthrow all that can be said in favor of Judaism or the seventh-day Sabbath."

REPLY.—Eld. P. has here outstripped the most ultra of his no-law brethren, in the assertion that the old covenant was what was written on tables of stone, and *that only*. We will let him introduce the testimony which he claims proves this point, and then we will show that not a syllable of what was engraven on stones was included in the old covenant at all. The quotations are lengthy, and the reader will perceive that they concern other questions a great deal more than they do the ten commandments. But we hope he will have patience to read them carefully through, considering all the while that they are from New England's champion opponent of the seventh-day Sabbath, and see how much abolition of the Sabbath he can find therein.

Proble.—"THE TWO TABLES OF STONE. What did they contain? Let the following answer: 'And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.' Deut. iv, 12, 13.' Where were these tables of stone kept? 'And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly: and the Lord gave them unto me. And I turned myself, and came down from the mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made, and there they be, as the Lord commanded me.' Deut. x, 4, 5.

"This shows that the tables were put into an 'ark' made expressly for that purpose. Where was the ark then put? 'And thou shalt hang up the veil under the

taches, that thou mayest bring in thither within the veil the ark of the testimony: and the veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy. And thou shalt put the mercy-seat upon the ark of the testimony in the most holy place.' Ex. xxvi, 33, 34. 'And the priests brought in the ark of the covenant of the Lord unto his place, to the oracle of the house, into the most holy place, even under the wings of the cherubims. For the cherubims spread forth their wings over the place of the ark, and the cherubims covered the ark and the staves thereof above. There was nothing in the ark save the two tables which Moses put therein at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of Egypt.' 2 Chron. v, 7, 8, 10.

"With this agrees the testimony of the apostle Paul: 'Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made, the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil the tabernacle, which is called the holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy-seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly.' Heb. ix, 1-5.

"Now let it ever be remembered, that under the 'first covenant,' God's dwelling-place for his people—or his 'mercy-seat'—was 'between the cherubims,' as the following passage will more fully show: 'And the cherubims shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy-seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy-seat shall the faces of the cherubims be. And thou shalt put the mercy-seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony. of

all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.' Ex. xxv, 20-22.

"And strange as it may appear to us, none but the *high priest* alone was ever permitted to approach the 'mercy-seat,' and that only *once a year*: "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest once alone every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people.' Heb. ix, 6, 7. Hence we see that God's ancient people had no privilege of approaching the 'mercy-seat' for themselves."

REPLY. At the commencement of the quotation just given, Eld. P. set out to prove that the two tables of stone contained the old covenant. Having given his long quotations of scripture, he reaches the conclusion that "God's ancient people had no privilege of approaching the mercy-seat for themselves." The connection between these two points we leave the reader to discover if he can.

It is true that the ten commandments are called a covenant; and because there is testimony that some covenant has been done away, and there are scriptures which speak of the ten commandments as a covenant, our opponents put these two classes of scriptures together, and declare that the ten commandments have been done away. This is a very illogical method of reasoning. Before they can offer such a conclusion, they should prove one of two things: either 1. That there was no other covenant but the ten commandments in existence, previous to the time when some covenant was done away, so that it must necessarily have been the ten commandments; or 2. That if there were other covenants in existence, the ten commandments are unmistakably the one which is pointed out as done

away. But neither of these points are proved by them; and hence their conclusion is wholly illegitimate. If scripture can be used in the way they use it, Eld. P. might have proved his points without referring to the covenants at all. Thus he could have shown the abolition of the Sabbath by quoting Ex. xx, 10, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," with 2 Cor. iii, 11, "which is done away." And then he could have proved his Sunday Sabbath by quoting 1 Cor. xvi, 2, thus; Now "upon the first day of the week let every one of you *lay by*!" "But it will be seen that this would not be the most innocent way of dealing with scripture.

Let us then inquire briefly into the question of the covenants. What constituted the first covenant? What the second? Are the ten commandments the first, second, or neither? There are many definitions of the word covenant, and there are various kinds of covenants. The word is defined thus: "Any disposition, arrangement, institution or dispensation: hence a testament, will; a covenant; i. e., mutual promises on mutual conditions, or promises with conditions annexed; by metonymy, a body of laws and precepts." *Greenfield.*

What was the first covenant? Before answering this question we will offer a few words to show that it was not the ten commandments.

1. The first covenant was made with Israel when they came out of Egypt; Heb. viii, 9; but the ten commandments existed from the beginning and were binding on man from Adam down; and the principles of each one, especially the Sabbath, are revealed to us in the book of Genesis.

2. The first covenant had ordinances of divine ser-

vice and a worldly sanctuary, Heb. ix, 1; but the ten commandments say nothing about a sanctuary, or any system of worship. It must be evident to all that the covenant to which these things belong, must have something to say concerning them. The ten commandments have nothing to say, and hence are not that covenant. It matters not that the tables of stone were put into the ark, and the ark into the sanctuary; it was that system of worship of which the sanctuary and its services were a part, not the ten commandments.

3. The first covenant had a priesthood, and contained the laws regulating it, Heb. ix, 6; but the ten commandments have nothing whatever to say about priesthood.

4. The service of the first covenant "stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances." Heb. ix, 10. This being true, there was not one of the ten commandments in that covenant, unless they came under the head of meats, drinks, divers washings and carnal ordinances.

5. The first covenant was dedicated with blood. Verse 18. The ten commandments were not so dedicated.

6. Moses spoke all the precepts of the first covenant; Heb. ix, 19; but the ten commandments were spoken not by Moses, but by God himself from the summit of Sinai.

7. The first covenant was written in a book by Moses. Ex. xxiv, 4, 7. The ten commandments were written with the finger of God upon two tables of stone.

8. The first covenant provided blood which could, and did, take away sins in figure, but could not take

them away in fact. Heb. x, 3, 4. The ten commandments said nothing about blood whatever.

We might continue this contrast to a still greater extent; and every time, we should find by what is declared of the first covenant, that the ten commandments could not be that covenant. What, then, did constitute that covenant? We have seen from the definition given of the word covenant, that it primarily signifies a mutual agreement between two parties upon mutual conditions. Do we find any agreement entered into between God and Israel when he had brought them out of the land of Egypt? We do. In Ex. xix, 5, we read that God made to Israel, through Moses the following proposition: "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation." To this the people responded, verse 8, "All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do." Here was a covenant entered into between God and the people. They made mutual pledges to each other. The people were to obey God's voice and keep his covenant, and he, on his part, was to make them a peculiar treasure, a kingdom of priests, a holy nation unto himself. Now as this covenant was to make them a distinct and peculiar people from all the rest of the world, it must include that which made them thus distinct and separate. And what was that? Answer. Their ordinances of divine service, their sanctuary and its ministrations, in a word, the whole body of their ceremonial regulations. Read what Paul says in the book of Hebrews about the first covenant with this view, and there is harmony throughout, but read it with the

idea that the ten commandments constituted that covenant, and we are involved at every step in utter contradiction.

But the reader may be ready to inquire, what covenant the ten commandments are, or were, if they were not the first or old covenant; for they are plainly called a covenant. We answer, *God's covenant*, existing independently of any action on the part of man. To prove this we introduce Ex. xix, 5. When God was entering into that covenant which he made with Israel, while yet he was proposing to the people what he would do on certain conditions, one of his conditions was, that they should keep "*his covenant*." This shows that God's covenant, antedates the covenant made with Israel at Horeb; it was already in existence when that arrangement was entered into between God and Israel; and on the condition of their keeping his covenant, the blessings of the Horeb covenant were suspended. To keep his covenant was the same as to obey his voice. To obey his voice, was to observe that law which he uttered with his voice from Mt. Sinai, the principles of which had existed and were known from Eden down. Hence we read in Deut. iv, 13: "And he declared unto you his covenant which he *commanded you to perform*, even ten commandments." Now a covenant *commanded*, and a mutual agreement entered into between two parties, are two things. And this language being used in reference to the ten commandments, shows that they are an independent covenant on the part of God, owing nothing of their existence to any action on the part of man, but something which God as the creator and ruler of the race, enjoins upon them to be obeyed. Thus God's covenant, the covenant commanded, is co-extensive with

moral obligation. The ten commandments are doubtless called a covenant on account of the promises annexed to their faithful observance; for in keeping them, as the Psalmist says, there is great reward.

We have now seen what constituted the old covenant, and what kind of a covenant the ten commandments are. We next inquire concerning the new covenant. The terms first and second, old and new, are only relative terms. The covenant introduced by Christ is called the second and the new, only because a covenant had preceded it, which was the first, and which having passed away is the old in distinction from the new which remains. This shows that these two covenants have reference to the same general principles; for a covenant referring to one object could not be a first or second, as related to another which referred to an entirely different object. The great blessing declared to be secured by the second covenant is, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." Heb. viii, 12. Then the second covenant cannot be any thing which makes known sin or unrighteousness; for unrighteousness and sin existed before it, and the object of this covenant was to take away such sin. Hence the new covenant cannot be composed of any moral law, "new code" or old, or any rule of life; but there must be such a law existing to show what sin is, independent of this new covenant, and distinct from it. This will be apparent to all minds, yet Eld. P. has here fallen into the confusion of making the new covenant the new code of laws, which he contends was given by Christ!

We have seen that the old covenant consisted of the arrangement by which sins were taken away in figure; and as the new covenant results in our sins' be-

ing remembered no more, the only conclusion left us is, that it is some arrangement by which our sins are taken away in fact. In other words it is the gospel, the superior sacrifice, service, and ministration of this dispensation, by which sins can be in reality pardoned. Hence Paul says of Christ, Heb. viii, 6, "He is the mediator of a better covenant, established upon better promises." Why is this covenant a better covenant than the old? Eld. P.'s arguments answer like this: Because under it we are released from keeping the seventh-day Sabbath [notwithstanding we have to keep another day, Sunday, just as strictly]; but Paul carries the idea that it is because it is established upon better promises. And what are these better promises? Answer. The promise that sins shall be taken away in fact, whereas under the former covenant they were taken away only in figure. There, remembrance was made of sins every year; Heb. x, 3; but here, sins are to be taken away so as to be remembered no more forever.

A word now in reference to moral law under these two covenants. Is it the same under the second that it was under the first? The second covenant was a subject of prophecy; and the prophecy has something to say about the law that should be binding under it. Jer. xxxi, 31-34: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put

my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people." Now what law is this, which under the new covenant was to be written in the hearts of his people?

Answer. The same law, beyond controversy, which God in the days of Jeremiah could call his law; and no one can deny but that was the ten commandments. Mark also the declaration of God that *he* will write it in the hearts of his people. God is ever the writer of his own law. Under the first covenant *he* wrote it on two tables of stone; under the new *he* writes it on the fleshly tables of the heart. Hence the very prophecy that declared that a new covenant should be made, declared also that under that covenant, the ten commandments should be written in the hearts of the children of God. Why will not men believe this testimony, and cease their assertions that the law has been abolished, or their vain imaginings about a new code having taken the place of the former? If we are living under the new covenant, as we certainly are, here are the ten commandments in all their life and power; not shut away from us, by being enclosed in an earthly ark, as under the shadowy dispensation of old, but brought home to every true believer by being stamped with the Spirit of God upon his heart. And he who has not this law thus written in his heart, cannot be in covenant relation with the God of this new covenant.

In our remarks upon 2 Cor. iii, in relation to the two ministrations, we promised to show what law it is of which we now have the ministration of the Spirit. We here see clearly enough. It is the ten commandments. Under the former dispensation the ministration pertaining to those commandments was the ministration of death, under this, it is the ministration of

the Spirit. Under the old covenant there was a real law that had been transgressed, hence real guilt, demanding a real atonement; but a real atonement could not be made with the blood of beasts, which was the only blood provided by that covenant; hence the necessity of a new covenant which should provide a real atonement that could take away real guilt. Thus the old covenant had reference to the ten commandments, by taking away man's transgression of them, in figure. The new covenant has relation to the same commandments by taking away man's transgression of them, in fact.

Preble.—"But let us here pause a moment, and inquire, *Where are now the 'two tables of stone'?* And echo must answer, *WHERE!* For that once holy place, where those tables were kept, is now destroyed; and the vail which kept all but the high priest from the mercy-seat, has been 'rent in twain from the top to the bottom;' and the ark and the two tables of stone have also been destroyed. The priesthood, which made atonement for the people at that altar, has been changed; and as the apostle says, there has been a change also of the law, or of the covenant. If therefore the tables of stone which contained the law, or the covenant, for keeping the seventh-day Sabbath,—the most holy place where the tables and covenant were kept, the mercy-seat above them,—and God's ancient dwelling-place 'between the cherubims' all destroyed; and a new and living way, which the living Jesus 'hath consecrated (or new made—margin) for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh' (x, 20); I say, if all this change has taken place, *WHERE IS THERE NOW ANY LAW OR COVENANT TO BE FOUND FOR KEEPING THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH?* Let the man who is able point it out if he can!"

REPLY.—Eld. P. may not be aware of the fact, but he has here proposed no very hard task; for he only calls upon the "man who is able" to point it out "if

he can;" but the man "who is able," certainly "can" do it without any difficulty. He asks "Where are now the two tables of stone?" and echo, he says, must answer, "Where!" The Sabbath question is a very singular question, exciting such opposition to itself, Rom. viii, 7, that even "echo" can scarcely give a correct response concerning it. In reply to the question, "*Where in the New Testament do we find any command to keep the seventh day?*" echo once answered, "*No where!*" See Review of Fillio, p. 41. Eld. P's echo is a little more within bounds as it does not supply words not found in the question; yet it is a little singular that echo which usually deals with the closing portion of an exclamation should patiently wait till the sentence is finished, and then go back and repeat the first word, with such emphasis, dropping all the rest.

But we return to the question, *Where are now the two tables of stone?* In answering this question, we shall show that it matters not what has become of the tables that existed in the sanctuary of old; for there are tables of that law, still existing, as superior to those as the heavens are higher than the earth.

We therefore turn from the ghostly visions of the "old dead schoolmaster," which have thus far seemed to haunt Eld. P., to give a moment's attention to the subject of the sanctuary. The sanctuary has ever been to us, since we received the light on it, a delightful subject. Neither is it so foreign to the Sabbath as might at first sight be supposed; for it throws around the perpetuity and immutability of the great law of ten commandments, bulwarks of adamant, which will stand fast forever.

The tables of stone, as they existed on earth under

the former dispensation, were written by God and delivered to Moses on Mt. Sinai. They were carefully deposited in an ark, not "made expressly for the purpose," as Eld. P. asserts; for it had other uses besides being a mere receptacle of the law; but a very sacred part of the furniture of the sanctuary. This ark was then placed in the most holy place of the earthly sanctuary, into which no man was to enter, but the high priest once every year. These distinguishing honors bestowed upon the law, its being spoken with God's own voice, written with his own finger, placed in the ark, and that placed in the holy of holies, all go to show that the law engraven upon the tables, in the very bosom of which rested the Sabbath commandment, was the most sacred object connected with that dispensation. The ark, on account of its containing the tables of the law, was called the ark of the covenant, and the tables, the tables of the covenant; for, as we have seen, God declared his ten commandments to be *his* covenant; and the ark could not, and would not, have been called the ark of the covenant, had it not contained the tables of the ten commandments. Bear this fact in mind till we make the application.

Into a description of the sanctuary, the building erected by Moses, with its holy and most holy places, we need not enter. It will be found in great minuteness in Ex. xxv-xxx; of the ark as the furniture of the most holy place, we have already spoken. In the holy place there were the table of show-bread, the candlestick with its seven lamps, and the altar of incense. The service connected with the sanctuary was briefly this: The man who had sinned brought his victim to the door of the tabernacle, placed his hand upon the victim's head, and confessed over him his

sin, thus transferring to him his guilt, and by giving him up to be slain, acknowledging himself to be worthy of death. The blood of the victim was taken, and by the priest carried into the sanctuary and sprinkled before the veil. This service went on daily through the year. At the close of this yearly service, the high priest went into the most holy place, with the blood of a sin-offering, before the ark containing the law of God which the people had transgressed, and sprinkled that blood upon the mercy-seat which was the cover of the ark, and before the mercy-seat to make atonement for the sins of the people, and to cleanse the sanctuary.

Let the reader now seriously ask himself what the object of this singular arrangement could be. As Eld. P. has said, that once holy place is now destroyed. The earthly sanctuary is gone, and its service discontinued. Was it a mere arbitrary arrangement which has failed of its purpose, and passed away? or did it possess some significance which is meeting its accomplishment in this dispensation?

That the ministry of those ancient priests, typified the ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ, none will deny. Did it ever occur to you that the *place* where those ancient priests ministered, the sanctuary, built at the express direction of God, was also designed to be a type or figure of the *place* where Christ performs his priestly office? Yet this is stated in the Scriptures, no less distinctly than the former. Listen to a few of the numerous instances in which the earthly sanctuary is declared to be but a pattern of the true; "Let them make me a sanctuary," said the Lord to Moses, "according to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the

instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it." Ex. xxv, 8, 9. Then the tabernacle and its instruments made by Moses, were not the original. They were but duplicates, made according to some great original which existed somewhere else. Again: "And thou shalt rear up the tabernacle according to the fashion thereof which was showed thee in the mount." Verse 40. See also chap. xxvi, 30; xxvii, 8. We read in Acts vii, 44, "Our fathers had the tabernacle of witness, in the wilderness, as he had appointed, speaking unto Moses that he should make it according to the fashion that he had seen." And Heb. ix, 24, says, "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures* of the true."

From this testimony but one conclusion can be drawn; namely, that there is a true or original sanctuary, which constituted the pattern from which the earthly tabernacle was erected. What is this true sanctuary or tabernacle, and where is it located? Paul definitely answers both these questions in Heb. viii, 1, 2. He has been showing the transfer of the priesthood from the house of Aaron to the everlasting priesthood of Christ, after the order of Melchisedec, and says, "Now of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum: We have such an high priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the Heavens, a minister of the *sanctuary* and of the *true tabernacle*, which the Lord pitched and not man." There can be no question but that Paul is here speaking of the antitype of the earthly sanctuary; for he contrasts it with that built by man. That was built by human instrumentality, this by the Lord. And Paul here states positively that the true sanctuary is in Heaven, and that Christ is our High Priest, minister-

ing for us in that Heavenly building. He then goes on in the remainder of the chapter to argue that as the priests on earth had a ministry to perform and sacrifices to offer, so Christ should minister in the sanctuary above; that the earthly building was made after the pattern of the Heavenly; and that the priests who served therein, served unto the example and shadow of Heavenly things. And he then proves that this change has taken place from the earthly to the Heavenly, by what? Nothing less than an application of Jeremiah's prophecy that the days should come when a *new covenant* should be made with the house of Israel.

Then this arrangement, this Heavenly sanctuary, and the superior priesthood of Christ is established by, and exists under, the new covenant. Paul says of the first covenant, Heb. ix, 1, "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary." This word, worldly, must have been introduced to express a contrast; for if no other covenant was to have a sanctuary, or if that was the only sanctuary that ever had existed, or was to exist, Paul would simply have said that that covenant had a sanctuary, without any qualifying word; but that was not sufficient; the idea must be expressed by way of contrast, that it was a *worldly* sanctuary. Paul is contrasting in the book of Hebrews, the two covenants, the old and the new, and the contrast expressed on the sanctuary must be respecting the sanctuaries of these two covenants. The first was a worldly or earthly sanctuary, that is, built by man; and what is the other? Answer, a heavenly sanctuary as Paul has shown, built by the Lord himself. To express it in full, it would then read like this: Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service and a

worldly sanctuary; the second covenant has a "more excellent" system of service, and a *heavenly* sanctuary. Paul makes this subject clear, beyond misapprehension, to those who will carefully study his language.

The book of Hebrews having clearly given us the theory of the Heavenly sanctuary, John in the Revelation gives us a view of the thing itself. In chap. iv, 1, he says that "a door was opened in Heaven;" not Heaven itself opened, but some building, some apartment, in Heaven, opened. In verse 5 he says that there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God, corresponding to the candlestick with its seven lamps in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary. In chapter viii, 3, 4, we read that an angel "came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer" and offered much incense, &c. Then here we have a view of the altar of incense, and a censer; but these were instruments of the sanctuary, the altar of incense being located, with the candlestick in the first apartment. All this shows clearly that John is looking into the first apartment of the Heavenly temple which the Lord pitched, and not man. We come down still further, to chapter xi, 19, and read, "And the temple of God was opened in Heaven," not the first apartment for that we have seen opened already, but the second apartment, as is proved by what John beheld therein, "and there was seen in his temple," he says, "*the ark of his testament.*"

We have now reached the point where the application of the foregoing remarks can be seen. It matters not to our present argument at what particular time the event here brought to view, the opening of the temple in Heaven, takes place, as all will agree that it transpires sometime in the present dispensation, which

is sufficient for our purpose. And now we ask the reader to look again at the fact that there was seen in his temple the *ark of his testament*. What was the ark? The chest in which the tables of the ten commandments were deposited. And is there such an ark under this dispensation, in the temple in Heaven? John says it was seen there, and hence we believe it is there. What is there in that ark in Heaven? John says it is the ark of *his testament*; and the word rendered testament is *διαθηκη*, the very same word that is in other places rendered covenant; the word which is rendered covenant in Deut. iv, 13, "And he declared unto you his *covenant*, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments." And as the ark of old, was called the ark of the covenant, only because it contained God's covenant of ten commandments, so when John beholding the ark in Heaven, calls it the ark of his [God's] testament or covenant, it is proof positive that that ark contains the same commandments. And that ark is connected with the sanctuary of this dispensation. It contains the law for this dispensation; and that law, just as it was when spoken by Jehovah from Sinai, is still called his covenant.

Thus we see that as the earthly sanctuary and its instruments, were but figures or patterns of the true, built after that great original, so the law given to Israel to be kept in that sanctuary, was but a copy, duplicate, or transcript of the original tables which he still retained in the ark in the sanctuary above. And this is our answer to Eld. P.'s question, "Where is there now any law or covenant for keeping the seventh-day Sabbath?" There it is, safely deposited in the archives of Heaven, beneath the eye of its great

Author, who slumbers not nor sleeps. If Eld. P. had not lost sight of this great original, he never would have asked this question; but having lost sight of it, and seeing nothing but the earthly arrangement, when that came to an end, when the sanctuary, and, so far as we know, the ark and those duplicate tables of stone, were destroyed, he seems to think that everything went by the board, and that God rubbed all out, and began anew. But nothing then perished that had not subserved its purpose, nothing failed of accomplishment; that sanctuary and that system had answered the end for which it was designed, and then what? No abolition of moral law, no break in the plan of salvation, no cessation of the work, but simply a transfer from the type to the antitype, from the shadow to the substance; and now we look away from earth to Heaven, and behold in the true tabernacle, the plan of salvation still going on, and our great High Priest there ministering for us; and there we behold the ark of his testament, and God's great moral law, reposing in security and glory beneath the mercy-seat, safe from all the opposition of men, or the malice of devils. The poet has well expressed it,

"For God well knew perdition's son,
Would ne'er his precepts love,
He gave a duplicate alone,
But kept his own above."

And as God so dealt with his law in the former dispensation, as to show that it was the most sacred object connected with that system of worship, does he not, by revealing it to us in the sacred ark in the holy of holies of the Heavenly temple, show that it is the most sacred of all inanimate objects even in the Heaven of heavens? And can that law be changed or abolished?

Oh, the infinite presumption of the thought! Vain man! Mount up to Heaven, drive the angels from your august presence, burst into the heavenly temple, remove Christ, dethrone Jehovah, clothe yourself with omnipotence, and *then* change that holy law! but never before that, never!

It will now be still more clearly seen that the law of God occupies the same position in both dispensations, or under both covenants. Under the former, a copy of that law was deposited in the typical sanctuary, and transgressions of it were typically atoned for by the blood of beasts; under the present, the original of that law exists in the ark in the sanctuary in Heaven, and transgressions of it, are in reality pardoned through the blood of Christ. But reader, can you approach the mercy-seat which covers that Heavenly ark, before which Christ pleads his blood, while beneath that mercy-seat lies the holy law you have transgressed,—we say, can you approach there with confidence, unless you are conscious that you are trying to keep every precept of that law just as it is written? And mark that the fourth precept reads, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

This little digression on the subject of the sanctuary has been rendered necessary in order to answer Eld. P.'s question, Where is there now any law or covenant for keeping the seventh day Sabbath; and we trust we have made this matter plain to every one however skeptical he may have been. We are now prepared to listen again to Eld. P.

Preble.—"But, says the objector, 'I do not believe the *new covenant* is now in force; neither do I believe

it can be until God writes his laws upon the heart, and all shall know him from the least to the greatest; and that, of course, cannot be until Christ comes the second time; and hence the law, or covenant, which contains the law for the Sabbath, will hold good until the end of the world, or until Christ comes. But if it can be shown that the new covenant is *now in force*, then I will give up that you are right.' Very well. Now in regard to this objection and admission, we will test the whole matter by the word of truth."

REPLY.—Eld. P. here seems to be making huge preparations to demolish a man of straw. We have never heard the objection raised by any Sabbath-keeper, that the new covenant is 'not now in force.' We know of none who hold that position. But if Eld. P. has found such a curiosity in the way of an opponent, we find ourselves under the necessity of listening to his answer, as we have promised to give his articles entire, though it has no application to seventh-day Adventists.

Preble.—"The particular prophecy in relation to this new covenant is found in Jer. xxxi, 31-34. But as the apostle quotes this in Heb. viii, 10-13, I trust all will be candid enough to take the same view of it as is given in the New Testament; and hence we proceed:—

"For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.'

"The objection to my view, as has just been raised,

consists in this:—When this new covenant is in force, the Lord is to put his laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts, and 'all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest.' Now the first question to be settled is this,—To whom, or to what class of persons does this 'all' refer? Does it refer to all mankind living at that time? Or does it refer to all of that particular class who believe in or observe this covenant? I will now show that it must refer to a *particular class*, and *not to every body*, as will be seen by the passage just quoted that the covenant is made '*with the house of Israel.*' Now let it be remembered, that the Lord has nowhere even intimated that he will ever make a covenant with the Gentiles, as such, and then bring in the 'house of Jacob' under such a covenant as that. But, as we see by the passage under consideration, he has promised to make a covenant '*with the house of Israel:*' and all candid minds will see that the Gentiles will be brought in under this. This great truth is clearly presented in the 11th of Romans. The apostle inquires;—What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded,' (or *hardened*—margin), and then adds,—'through their fall salvation is come to the Gentiles.' (Rom. xi, 7, 11.) Hence we see that Israel is not grafted in among the Gentiles, but the Gentiles are *grafted in among them*, the natural branches."

REMARKS.—We say remarks; for we have nothing to "reply" to here, inasmuch as we endorse it all; but we cannot forbear reminding the reader, of Eld. P.'s previous reasoning on this point. When speaking of the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles that had been broken down, in his zeal to show that the Gentiles had nothing to do with the law by which the Jews were governed, he asked the following question: "Was the middle wall of partition broken down that the Gentiles might *go in* where the Jews *had been!* or were the Jews to *come out* where the

Gentiles were?" He was then arguing that the Jews, leaving all the institutions committed to their charge, were to come out to the Gentiles; we are glad to find him now turned square about, and arguing on the right side of this question, namely that the Gentiles were admitted into the commonwealth of Israel to be partakers with them of their blessings. We submit to the reader that his present argument sounds much better than his former.

Preble.—"Therefore Israel proper are the natural branches of 'their own olive tree,' and the Gentiles are grafted in among them. Hence the blindness—or hardness—is happened to Israel, 'until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved.' The apostle then immediately adds,—'For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.' (Rom. xi, 25-27.) Now if we can find when God shall take away their sins, then we find when his new covenant shall be with them. We have now reached a point where I will propose to my objector above alluded to the following question:—

WHEN WILL THE LORD TAKE AWAY, OR FORGIVE MEN THEIR SINS?—Will it be in this world, while Christ is the 'mediator between God and men'? Or will it not be until after Christ comes the second time, to 'judge the quick and the dead'? O, says the objector, in this world, certainly. Very well. This shows us that if men's sins are forgiven them in this world, (Matt. xi, 31, 32), then the new covenant is for this world; for we are now considering the passage which says: 'This is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.' But again, the Greek word here rendered 'take away,' is *aphaireo*; and it is found elsewhere in the New Testament but once, when it is applied to sins; and this will be found in Heb. x, 4: "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away (*aphaireo*) sins.' So of the passage in Romans: 'This is my covenant unto them when I shall take away (*aphaireo*) their sins.' By this, then, we

learn that it was impossible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sins under the first covenant, and therefore those who lived under the first covenant must have their sins forgiven by virtue of the 'mediator of the New Testament,' or covenant, as we learn by the following passage:

"And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.' Heb. ix, 15.

"But a few words here in relation to this word which is translated *testament* in this last quotation. In the Greek this word is *diatheke*; and it is found in the New Testament thirty-three times. It is rendered *covenant* twenty, and *testament* thirteen times. Its meaning according to Greenfield's Greek Lexicon, is 'any disposition, arrangement, institution, dispensation,' etc. Thus we are to understand this word *diatheke* in the sense of covenant; and to mean the Lord's institution, or arrangement, to save men, whether it was under the *old* or the *new* dispensation. The first *diatheke*, or covenant, written upon 'tables of stone,' is disannulled' (Heb. vii, 18); but the *diatheke*, or covenant, written 'in fleshly tables of the heart,' is *now* for the benefit and salvation of men.

REMARKS. Eld. P. has here given us a good definition of the word covenant; it is "the Lord's arrangement to save men," whether "under the *old* or *new* dispensation." Now if, in speaking of the first covenant, he would be careful to confine it, according to his definition of that covenant, to the arrangement that then existed to save men, he would save himself and his readers much confusion. But here we find him saying that the first covenant was written on tables of stone. But there was no "arrangement to save men" written on the tables of stone. Nothing of the kind. But under that arrangement, *God's law* was written on

the tables of stone, and that only. Hence, the tables of stone do not constitute the covenant which has been disannulled. But that typical arrangement has been disannulled, and a better one instituted in its place; and under this new arrangement, the *law*, not the arrangement or covenant, is written in the hearts of God's people, the same law which under the former arrangement was written on the tables of stone.

Preble.—"We have already seen that sins could not be taken away under the first covenant. Let us now examine and see if sins can be taken away, or forgiven, under the '*new covenant*.' The apostle explains this by saying:

"The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building. Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. ix, 8-14.

"But the apostle continues and says: 'For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the wor-

shippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God. Above, when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offering and offering for sin thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.' Heb. x, 1-10.

"And again he says: 'Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us; for after that he had said before, this is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord. I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin. Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he has consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having an High Priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.' Heb. x, 15-22.

"By these three portions of scripture we are shown how and when sins are taken away. In the first it is said, 'The Holy Ghost this signifying'; that 'gifts and sacrifices' under the first covenant 'could not make' any one 'perfect, pertaining to the conscience.' But under the new covenant, Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come by his own blood, through the eternal Spirit, could purge the conscience;

so we can serve the living God. Hence we see that our sins can be taken away by the blood of Christ, and not merely carried into the wilderness on the head of a 'live goat,' as was the case under the first covenant.

"In the second it is said, The law, being a shadow of the good things to come, *can never with those sacrifices make the comers thereunto perfect.* For if this could have been done, the worshipers once purged would 'have had no more conscience of sins.' But in those sacrifices there is a *remembrance again made of sins EVERY YEAR.*' Because it was not possible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sins. But when Jesus Christ came, he said, 'Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.' And so Jesus, our High Priest, took away the first covenant, that he might establish the second covenant. And by this will, or covenant, *we are sanctified.* Praise God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"In the third it is said, The Holy Ghost also is a witness to us, as it had been said before, *This is the covenant that the Lord promised unto our fathers; and under it, brethren, we have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which has been 'consecrated for us.'* Then 'let us draw near with a true heart,' 'having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.'"

REMARKS.—The word here rendered "holiest," into which we enter by the blood of Jesus, is in the original "holy places," meaning the holy places of the sanctuary above. Think, reader, what that sanctuary is for, and what it contains. But for what purpose could this imaginary objection, about the new covenant's not being now in force, have been raised, and then these ponderous quotations of scripture introduced to rebut it? We call it an imaginary objection; for Eld. P. must have known that such was not our position; at least he had no excuse for not knowing it, for a few moment's examination of any of our publications

touching that point, would have satisfied him that we held no such view.

Eld. P. continues his argument to show that the new covenant is now in force. Had what he has written been relevant to the question in hand, we had not had so much to say about its length and the tedious quotations from scripture in connection with it. All scripture is good in its place; but one would not like to be compelled to read the first chapter of Chronicles in the midst of an argument for baptism, nor the thirty-eighth of Ezekiel on the doctrine of repentance. There is such a thing as being too prolix on any subject, even though what is said be measurably to the point; but to be treated to long columns of matter that have no bearing whatever on the question, is a tax upon the reader for which we feel constrained continually to apologize to him, and request him to have patience to follow to its close this novel argument against the seventh-day Sabbath. We have this consolation, however, in the matter: When Eld. P. is treating on the subject of the new covenant's being now in force, he is not taking up our time with the subject of the washing of the saints' feet, or the sanctuary; and the whole range of subjects which can possibly be connected with the seventh-day Sabbath, will soon be exhausted.

But Eld. P. seems to think the prophet Isaiah has something to say which proves the abolition of the seventh-day Sabbath. We will patiently listen.

Preble.—"But again we inquire, who are the 'all' referred to, who are to know the Lord? Let Isaiah the prophet answer:—

'Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the

desolate, than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord.' 'For thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited.' 'For this is as the waters of Noah unto me; for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth: so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee.' 'And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord: and great shall be the peace of thy children.' 'No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper: and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord: and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord.'—Isa. liv, 1, 3, 9, 10, 13, 17.

"This says 'thy seed' (Israel's seed) shall inherit the Gentiles, and *all thy children* shall be taught of the Lord. Now what says Mr. Objector? Does the 'all' mean *all mankind* or does it mean '*all thy children*'? It must mean all thy children, I think."

REPLY.—We think so too.

Preble.—"But I have still more to present to prove that the 'new covenant' is now in force. And in doing so I will continue to contrast the condition of the church, or people of God, under the

"TWO DIFFERENT COVENANTS.

"1. We inquire, *Where* were the two covenants written? The *first* was written on '*two tables of stone*.'—The *second* is written '*in fleshy tables of the heart*.' (2 Cor. iii, 3.) 2. We inquire, *How* were these two covenants written? The *first* 'with the finger of God.' (Ex. xxxi, 18.) The *second* 'with the Spirit of the living God.' (2 Cor. iii, 2.)

REPLY.—The fallacy into which Eld. P. has here fallen has already been pointed out. It was the *law*, not the covenant, which under the first covenant was

written on the tables of stone; and it is the *law*, Jer. xxxi, 33, not the covenant, which under the new covenant is written in the heart. On a distinction so plain as this, confusion is inexcusable.

Preble.—"A few passages will now be presented to prove that

"THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT IS NOW IN THE HEART.

"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing, or else excusing, one another.' 'Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God, and who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.' 'For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' 'And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.'—Rom. ii, 14, 15; 2 Cor. i, 21, 22, iv, 6; Gal. iv, 6."

REPLY.—It is very evident that "the work of the Spirit is now in the heart." But does this testimony quoted by Eld. P., say that the Spirit writes the covenant in the heart? Not an intimation of any such thing. But what is it? Why, in plain term, "the work of the law written in their hearts." This corresponds with the prediction of the new covenant, which was that under it, the law should be written in the hearts of God's covenant people.

Preble.—"3. Under the *first* covenant, did '*all*' have the privilege of *knowing the Lord* for themselves? That is, did *all* have the privilege of approaching God for themselves?

COULD EACH FOR HIMSELF COME TO THE 'MERCY-

SEAT'? Let the following answer: 'Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people.'—Heb. iii, 6, 7.

REPLY.—Well, suppose each one could not, under the former dispensation, approach God for himself, suppose they had to come to him through the medium of an outward priesthood, and suppose each one can now come for himself boldly to the throne of grace, how does this affect the existence of the moral law of God? In no degree whatever.

But Eld. P. argues that each one can now come for himself to the mercy-seat. We are happy to find him thus arguing, for it gives us an opportunity to inquire what the mercy-seat is. The mercy-seat was the cover of the ark. Had there been no ark there would have been no mercy-seat; and wherever a mercy-seat is, there must be an ark. Now if there is a mercy-seat in this dispensation for men to approach to, then there is an ark in this dispensation; and if there is an ark, there are ten commandments in that ark, constituting the law for this dispensation, exactly such as existed in the typical ark of old. If men will abolish the law, they must dispense with the ark, and if they dispense with that, they must give up all ideas of a mercy-seat in this dispensation, and if they give up that, then they must yield all the blessings of the gospel, and the whole plan of salvation. This is what goes by the board, when the "law goes by the board," about which we hear so much; for the law of God, whether in the old dispensation or the present, is the heart and center of the whole arrangement.

We often hear the expression, that "Christ is still upon the mercy-seat." The great fact thus recognized that there is a mercy-seat in this dispensation, is correct; but the figure is wrong; for it was never the prerogative of the high priest to take his seat upon the top of the ark; but Christ pleads his blood *before* the mercy-seat (the place where mercy sits, not the high priest), blood shed to make atonement for man's transgression of a certain law that lies in the ark beneath the mercy-seat. Reader, has your heart ever been made glad that there is still a mercy-seat above, a place where "mercy and truth are met together, and righteousness and peace have kissed each other;" a place where you may trustingly come for the forgiveness and pardon of your sins? Then do not quarrel with the law that reposes in living majesty beneath it. In vain will that man come to the mercy-seat for pardon, who is knowingly violating any one of the precepts of the royal law over which the mercy-seat is placed; for our Saviour in the very opening sermon of his mission, was careful to give utterance to this solemn truth, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." Matt. vii, 21. The original word here translated "will," is *θελημα* which Greenfield in this instance defines, "precept, statute." Our Lord's declaration, then, is simply this, that only those who, in addition to calling him, Lord, that is, acknowledging his authority and heeding his teachings, should also do the precepts of his Father, could enter into the kingdom of Heaven.

And so important does the Lord apparently deem this fact that he does not leave it with being once stated. In the closing verses of the closing chapter of

the closing revelation of the sacred volume, it is again solemnly announced: "Blessed are they," says Christ, "that do *his* [the Father's] commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gate into the city."—Rev. xxii, 14.

Preble.—"The only person who was permitted to approach the 'mercy-seat,' was the high priest alone once a year. And hence no one knew whether he was accepted of God, only as the high priest performed the service for him. And this was done in the following very odd way, viz:—

"And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat; and Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness."—Lev. xvi, 20-22. "And thus it appears that all those who lived under the *old covenant* never knew whether they were accepted of God *only as they learned it* from the high priest. And so it was, as the thing strikes one at this late day, that a *live goat* was their Saviour. And so it rather strikes me that those who are determined to hold on to the *old law*, or the *old covenant*, have for their teacher—instead of the LIVING JESUS—an '*old dead schoolmaster*,' and for a Saviour, a *live goat*."

REPLY.—What the object can be, of these remarks about the "very odd way" and the "live goat" being their "Saviour," we do not know, unless it be to cast a little ridicule upon that ancient typical service. But Eld. P. has fallen into error in supposing that the live goat was their Saviour. The live goat did not at all typify the coming Saviour. It was the blood of the

goat which was slain on the day of atonement, which was used to remove the sins of Israel from the sanctuary, and which typified the sacrifice which the Saviour was to make on Calvary.

Eld. P. then speaks of "those who are determined to hold on to the old law," meaning thereby, of course, the ceremonial law; for that was the law which regulated the service of the sanctuary; and Eld. P. has once acknowledged that the ceremonial law, and the moral law, or ten commandments, were separate and distinct. Now we know of no professor of the Christian religion who is holding on to the ceremonial law of old, and depending on a live goat for a saviour. If there are any such we should be happy to have Eld. P. point them out to us.

Preble.—"O that the Spirit of the living God might write upon the hearts of every seventh-day Sabbath keeper this important truth, that the same system of religious ordinances, or ceremonies, which required a live goat to take away man's sins into the wilderness on his *head*, was also the same system of service which required the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. And the entire system was established upon that old covenant which was written upon tables of stone, as will appear to any student of the Bible who will carefully examine the books of Exodus and Leviticus, as compared with the epistle to the Hebrews."

REPLY.—If this writing upon the heart was left to men to do, what a scrawl we should have! What blurs, blots, scratches and contradictions! But, thank God, this work is committed to the Holy Spirit, which writes nothing but what is according to the mind of God. However fervently, therefore, Eld. P. may desire the Spirit to write upon our hearts that the same system that required the live goat to take away sins, required the observance of the seventh-day Sab-

bath, it never will write it, for the Holy Spirit never writes lies! Besides, it is not the province of the Spirit to write in our hearts ecclesiastical histories or theological commentaries.

But if that system of ceremonies was the one that required the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, it was the one also that forbade our having other Gods besides Jehovah, worshiping images, taking his name in vain, killing, committing adultery, stealing, bearing false witness, and coveting; and if the seventh-day Sabbath has gone, these others have also gone; as no re-enactment of them can be found any more than of the Sabbath. They all rest on the same basis.—There are thousands of lawless villains all over the land who from the blackness of their hearts, would rejoice at the reasoning of Eld. P., which leads to such results. But the prophet says that it is a “horrible thing,” to “strengthen the hands of evil doers.”—Jer. xxiii, 14.

Preble.—“It may be seen at a glance, by noticing the few portions of Scripture which follow, that the whole system was to *cease* with their generations,—seventh-day Sabbath and all; as they were only given to the children of Israel, “throughout their generations.” I will now give a few instances, and my readers can satisfy themselves by examining them.

“THE PASSOVER. ‘And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations: ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever.’—Ex. xii, 14.

“BURNT OFFERING. ‘This shall be a continual burnt offering throughout your generations at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord, where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee. And there I will meet with the children of Israel, and the tabernacle shall be sanctified by my glory. And I will sanctify the tabernacle of the congregation, and

the altar: I will sanctify also both Aaron and his sons, to minister to me in the priest’s office. And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God.’—Ex. xxiii, 42-45.

“SEVENTH WEEK SABBATH. ‘And he shall proclaim on the selfsame day, that it may be a holy convocation unto you: ye shall do no servile work therein: it shall be a statute forever in all your dwellings throughout your generations.’—Lev. xxiii, 21.

“DAY OF ATONEMENT. ‘Ye shall do no manner of work: it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations in all your dwellings. It shall be unto you a Sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath.’—Lev. xxii, 31, 32.

“SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH. ‘And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed. And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.’—Ex. xxxi, 12-18.”

REPLY.—Of the Sabbath as a sign to Israel, throughout their generations, we have already spoken, and would refer the reader to our previous remarks on

pp. 16-22. And concerning this imposing display of parallelism between the Sabbath, passover, day of atonement, &c., we also refer the reader to what we have already said on this point. See pages 95-97.

But Eld. P. seems disposed to continue his chivalrous attacks upon his man of straw, that is, the objection that the new covenant is not now in force.—The whole system, he says, was demolished under the first covenant. We have shown that the former system was distinct from the moral law, and hence its passing away does not affect that law, or the Sabbath which is a part of it. In the light of what has been written, the reader can judge for himself what bearing the quotations introduced by Eld. P. have on the question of the Sabbath. And as there is no particular point of controversy here involved, no further special reply will be called for from us on this part of the subject.

Preble.—“If any one is disposed to examine this particular question still further, he can look at Ex. xxvii, 20, 21; xxx, 8, 10; xl, 15; Lev. x, 8, 9.

“*The Lord Jesus Christ not permitted to enter the holy places made with hands.* Although Christ was a high priest fitted to pass into ‘heaven itself,’ yet he was not permitted to enter the holy places in the temple; for he was not ‘after the order of Aaron,’ but was of the ‘tribe of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood.’ But although Christ could not enter ‘within the veil’ of the temple, to view the ‘mercy-seat’ there; yet when he expired upon the cross, by the power of God the Father ‘the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom’; and thus was demolished the whole system under the first covenant; and a ‘new and living way’ was then opened up, whereby all might ‘know the Lord from the least to the greatest’; as the following passages will prove, taken from

the three important witnesses, Jesus, Paul and John!

“*FIRST.* ‘All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.’ ‘And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.’—Matt. xi, 27-30; xxviii, 18-20.

“*SECOND.* ‘But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.’ ‘For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.’ ‘Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.’ ‘Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. By a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience,

and our bodies washed with pure water.' 'For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard, entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more: but ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.'—Rom. viii, 9, 14, 15, 16; Heb. iv, 14-16; x, 19-22; xii, 18, 19, 22-24.

"I hope not to be tedious to my readers by my lengthy quotations. But fearing the real point under consideration may be overlooked, I will again say, remember that I am proving that all can know the Lord for themselves now, under the *new covenant*; and not simply through an earthly priest, as it was under the first covenant; and the only way to get rid of sins, to have them carried into the wilderness on the head of a live goat. No! Praise the Lord, now, under the new covenant, all can know for themselves whether they are the children of God or not. Hear, then, the third witness, JOHN:—

"And hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him. For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. Beloved if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight. And this is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment.—And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.'

'Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of His Spirit.'—1 John iii, 19-24; iv, 13."

REPLY.—Eld. P.'s "third witness" talks very strongly about "the commandments of God." He says that whatsoever we ask, we receive of him; *because we keep his commandments*. These commandments of God are spoken of in distinction from the teachings of Christ. Now what commandments are these? The same writer speaks of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Rev. xiv. 12. The faith, or teachings and instruction, of Jesus, is one thing, the commandments of God are another and entirely different thing. What are these commandments? Every candid mind will confess that they are the ten commandments. Eld. P. has brought on to the stand a very unfortunate witness for him; for he uses language which completely demolishes the no-law-of-God theory.

Preble.—"But my objector continues and says, 'There is another point which has not been taken up yet, which is mentioned in the new covenant, and I don't believe it can be reconciled with your view of the subject. It is this:—*And their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more*; and this cannot take place in this world surely.' We will let the word of the Lord settle this objection also:—'But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year.' This shows us that under the first covenant it was impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins; therefore, there was a remembrance made of them again every year. (Heb. x, 3, 4.) But, praise God, it is not so now under the new covenant, as the following Scripture will prove: 'For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.' 'And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where the remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.'—Heb. x, 14, 17, 18.

'But my closing argument in favor of the 'new covenant' now being in force is this:—*Christ is now mediator of the new covenant*, as is clearly demonstrated by the following Scripture!—'But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.' 'And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.'—'And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.'—Heb. viii, 6; ix, 15; xii, 24.

The words of truth just quoted, prove beyond all cavil that we are now living under the new covenant. The Greek word here rendered mediator is *mesiteos*, and its meaning, according to Donnegan's Greek Lexicon, is 'one who is in the middle; one who intervenes, mediates, or arranges affairs between parties.' Now by turning to the book of Exodus, we shall find that there was a difference between God and the children of Israel, growing out of the affairs of the golden calf, while Moses was in charge of the first covenant; and the Lord said unto Moses, 'Let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them.' But Moses as a mediator, stepped in between God and the people, and made this memorable plea in their behalf:—

"And Moses besought the Lord his God, and said, Lord, why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people, which thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt with great power, and with a mighty hand? Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, and say, For mischief did he bring them out, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou sweardest by thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this

land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it forever.' See Ex. xxxii.

"The Lord heard this petition of Moses, so far as not to destroy *all* of the people; but still he was displeased with them; 'and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men.' And again Moses intercedes;—'And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin.—And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book.'

"Hence we see that where this covenant is 'written in tables of stone,' and then *shut away* from the people, Moses, as mediator, goes to the Lord on their behalf. But under the new covenant, which is 'written in fleshly tables of the heart,' *'all'* can approach unto God, through the LIVING JESUS, as their mediator.

"Now let my objector speak, and say whether I have proved that we are now living under the "new covenant" or not. If I have, let him own up. But if he still believes I have not, then let him meet me fairly, and show a better argument if he can."

REPLY.—We don't know whom Eld. P. is talking to here.

Prele.—"But to bring this argument to a close, which relates to a change of covenant,—of priesthood,—yea, of all things, at the time of Christ's first advent, including the time of his ministry, his death, and his resurrection; I will present a few texts to show that Christ was *lawgiver, prophet, chief corner-stone*, etc."

REPLY.—Eld. P. seems to have a wonderfully accommodating system. There must have been some point of time when the change took place from the old cove-

nant to the new; but Eld. P.'s system, probably on the ground that necessity knows no law, has it include "the time of his ministry, his death, and his resurrection." The reader will remember from his previous arguments that he includes also the ministry of John the Baptist. If he was pressed upon the subject, we doubt not he would include the ministry of the apostles. But all this will do him no good; for before he can establish his position he will have to include the ministry of the "man of sin." He promises a text "to show that Christ was law-giver." We shall wait with interest for that text, for we have never yet been able to find it.

Preble.—"It was therefore his right to make this change, with the aid of his Father. But first I will present one text to prove that *all things have become new*; and also, it will fix the point of time when this change took place:—'And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again. Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.' 2. Cor. v, 15-17. Mark this,—Jesus died and rose again, wherefore, from henceforth, know we no man after the flesh; therefore from this point, 'old things are passed away,' 'behold *all things are become new.*'"

Reply.—Eld. P.'s use of 2 Cor. v, 15-17, to show that a new Sabbath has been instituted in place of the old, is absolutely ludicrous. This is the second time it has been brought up, and it is urged even a third time, as good sound argument to prove the point. Any theory that compels men to use Scripture in this way, gives evidence of being in great straits. In Rev. xxi, 4, 5, we read of a time when God shall wipe away

all tears from the eyes of his people, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new." Here old things passing away, and all things being made new, refers to the destruction of this old earth, and the present constitution of things, and the creation of a new heaven, and new earth. Does it refer to the same thing in 2 Cor. v? According to Eld. P.'s interpretation it does; for he says that from the resurrection of Christ, old things, without qualification, are passed away, behold all things, without qualification, are become new.—Such is the folly into which we are liable to run, if we will not heed the qualification which the apostle has expressed in plain language before us: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature:" old things *to him* are passed away, behold *to him* all things are become new, and to him only. And how does it happen that it is so to him? Ans. Because on being converted to Christ, his heart was changed, the whole current of his affections, purposes, hopes and desires, took a new direction, and fastened themselves upon new objects. If Eld. P. will refer back to the time of his own conversion, he will doubtless be able to see in his own experience the force of this illustration of Paul's.

Preble.—"A few texts now to prove that our Living Jesus was and is a being of great authority and power; and also a prophet, the greatest of all prophets, and chief corner-stone, etc."

Reply.—Had we been present when Eld. P. thought of introducing the point here mentioned, we should have expostulated with him something like this: "Eld. P., remember that you are professedly arguing against the seventh-day Sabbath. Now please do not spend

your time, quoting long texts of scripture to prove that 'Jesus was and is a being of great authority and power;' for besides having no bearing on the question, there is no dispute on that point; nobody doubts it." But he has thought it necessary to prove this point for somebody's benefit, we don't know whose; and here is his testimony:

Preble.—On this point I will introduce three witnesses: Jesus, Peter and Paul. First witness, Jesus, at the commencement of his ministry: 'Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock.' 'And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand.' 'And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.'—Matt. vii, 24, 26, 29. Jesus after his resurrection:—'And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.'—Matt. xxviii, 18.

"Second witness. Peter:—'For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people.' 'Then Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them, Ye rulers of the people, and elders of Israel, if we this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole; be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand before you whole. This was the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which has become the head of the corner. Neither is their salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men

whereby we must be saved.'—Acts iii, 22, 23; iv, 8, 12.

"Third witness, Paul:—'For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.' 'God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.' 'By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament. And they truly were many priests because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but this man, because he continueth ever hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself. For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which

was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore."—Eph. ii, 14-20: Heb. i, 2-4: vii, 22-28.

REPLY.—The text which Eld. P. promised, to show that Christ is a lawgiver, we have not yet found, unless he considers it proved by the words of Christ, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine," &c. But all Christ's teachings, so far from proving himself a lawgiver, only show that he was enforcing the law, and carrying out the will, of another. He referred to a law existing before his time, and declared that he came not to destroy or supersede it. He affirmed that only those who kept the precepts of his Father should enter into the kingdom of Heaven. He repeatedly assured the people that the words that he spake, and the doctrines that he taught, were not his own, but His that sent him. John vii, 16; viii, 28; xii, 49; xiv, 10, 24. And on the back of this, James declares, chap. iv, 12, that "there is *one* lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy." If Christ is a lawgiver in addition to his Father, there are two instead of one; but John, to free this matter from all doubt, comes forward and says that Christ, instead of being lawgiver himself, is the advocate between the lawgiver, the Father, and guilty man who has transgressed the Father's law. 1 John ii, 1. No, Christ is not a lawgiver. He claims no such office. He gave, to be sure, directions and rules for the government of his church, but concerning the duties which man as the creature owes to God the Creator, and to his fellow-creatures, he did not legislate, but simply enforced the law of his Father.

Preble.—"Who can doubt for one moment, after thoroughly studying the truths contained in the foregoing portions of scripture from the New Testament, that there was an entire change in the system of di-

vine worship at the first advent of our Saviour, or as has been shown above, that 'old things are passed away; behold, *all things are become new*,' even a *new Sabbath, or Lord's day*."

REPLY.—"A new Sabbath, or Lord's day," is not essential to a new system of worship; and while we admit that the system of worship was changed from the typical to the antitypical, we might add that from that time there was a new God, a new Heaven, a new earth, or a new race of beings, just as consistently as Eld. P. can add that there was a new Sabbath. But as men can easily persuade themselves to believe that which they inordinately desire to be true, he is very positive that this means at least a new Sabbath or Lord's day. Very well, then we must have new regulations touching the other duties that are associated in the decalogue with the Sabbath. And these regulations must differ from the old, else they would be a part of the same "old dead schoolmaster" (?) not a new law. But according to Eld P., all has become new. And as the new Sabbath is kept on another day from the original, and for a different reason, being thus an entirely different institution, perhaps the other new regulations will permit us to worship graven images, swear, kill, lie, and steal, at least a little. Who knows?

Preble.—"This brings me once more to speak on the subject of the '*first day of the week*' as the Sabbath. In the closing part of my last number I referred to the fact that neither of the apostles ever attended another seventh-day meeting after the one mentioned in Acts xviii, 4. And I will now add, that this is the last time the word Sabbath is found in our version of the New Testament, except in Col. ii, 16. And no Sabbatarian will admit for one moment that that refers to the seventh-day Sabbath. Hence, it is proved that when Paul

said, 'From HENCEFORTH I will go unto the Gentiles,' (Acts xviii, 4-6,) he did do it; and after that there is an *entire silence* in the New Testament in regard to the seventh-day Sabbath as a day of worship."

REPLY.—We are happy to find Eld. P. coming back to the subject of the Sabbath. He speaks of the "first day of the week as the Sabbath." To the institution of the Sabbath the idea of holy or sacred time is inseparably attached; but if Sunday is the Sabbath, there is, according to Eld. P.'s own confession, nothing sacred about it; for he distinctly admitted in the first part of his article, that "if there is now one day more holy than another, made so by the express or direct command of Almighty God, then the seventh day is the one." Page 7.

The statement which Eld. P. has here repeated about Paul's turning to the Gentiles, and after that keeping silent about the Sabbath, will be found more at length, and the reply to the same, on pp. 127-129.

Preble.—"After this, the disciples held their meetings on the 'first day of the week,' as the following will prove:

"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow.' Acts xx, 17."

REPLY.—The original argument on this passage, and the reply, will be found on pp. 131-133.

Preble.—"Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.' 1 Cor. xvi, 2."

REPLY.—For an exposition of this passage of Scripture, see pp. 133, 134.

Preble.—"I was in the spirit on the Lord's day. Rev. i, 10."

REPLY.—For a reply to the argument usually based on this Scripture, and proof that the Sabbath of the Lord is here unmistakably referred to, see pp. 98-100.

Preble.—"What was the practice of the early Christians in regard to the Sabbath? The following unanswerable testimony is here presented in proof that the first day of the week was observed by the early Christians as the Sabbath, or Lord's day."

REPLY.—We now leave the unerring record, the firm ground, of the Holy Scriptures, and take our way into a region where the bogs and mire of error, corruption, and superstition, surround us on every side. Into this region the advocates of first-day sacredness almost invariably deem it necessary to go, for the support of their darling institution. With how much safety they can appeal to the records of a time when the inspired writers had all left the stage of action, may be determined from the fact that Paul declared that even in his day the mystery of iniquity already worked, and that after his departure grievous wolves should enter in, not sparing the flock, and that men of their own selves should arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. 2 Thess. ii, 7; Acts xx, 29-30. Without the most careful discrimination, those who appeal to this age, are liable to receive as honest Christians some of those "grievous wolves," and take as the genuine records of truth, those "perverse things," against which Paul has warned us.

Discerning writers have often cautioned us against the use that is made of the pretended testimony of the fathers. Says Bower, in his History of the Popes, Vol. I, p. 1: "To avoid being imposed upon, we ought to treat tradition as we do a notorious and known liar, to whom we give no credit, unless what he

says is confirmed to us by some person of undoubted veracity. . . . False and lying traditions are of an early date, and the greatest men have, out of a pious credulity, suffered themselves to be imposed upon by them."

Dowling, in his History of Romanism, book ii, chap. 1, says: "'The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.' Nor is it of any account in the estimation of the genuine Protestant *how early* a doctrine originated, if it is not found in the Bible."

Dr. Adam Clarke in his life, p. 134, uses the following strong language: "We should take heed how we quote the fathers in proof of the doctrines of the gospel; because he who knows them best, knows that on many of these subjects, they blow hot and cold." In commenting upon Prov. viii, he says: "But of these we may safely state that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed that cannot be proved by their authority: nor a *heresy* that has disgraced the Romish church, that may not challenge them as its abettors. In point of *doctrine*, their authority is, with me, nothing. The word of God alone contains my creed. On a number of points I can go to the Greek and Latin fathers of the church to know what *they believed*, and what the people of their respective communions believed; but after all this, I must return to God's word to know what he would have *me* to believe." For a further statement concerning the authority of the fathers, and how their writings have been corrupted by the Romish church, the reader is referred to the History of the Sabbath pp. 193-204.

This is plainly the principle to ever bear in mind, respecting the testimony of the fathers: If they found in the word of God, what they taught, we can find it

there too; if they did not find it there, of course it is no authority with us. How much Eld. P. has found in the word of God to sustain his position, the reader can judge from the examination of his theory thus far, and also, whether any amount of testimony from the scaly ages that succeeded the days of the apostles will be able to save it. But Eld. P. completes his array of evidence in behalf of Sunday by bringing in what purports to be the testimony of the Christian Fathers. What Eld. P. has given us under this head is simply a slice from the Sabbath Manual. Unfortunately, Eld. P. has quoted the Manual, not always the most reliable authority, without taking the trouble to test the correctness of the quotations. Had he done this, he never would have endorsed as "unanswerable testimony," that which turns out to be, principally, but the fossil remains of a few contemptible forgeries. The first witness is Ignatius. as follows:

Preble.—"Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, A. D. 101, who died only about half a dozen years after the death of the apostle John, speaks of the Lord's day familiarly and without explanations, as if everybody understood it. And he gives this title to the first day of the week exactly after the manner of the apostle himself. 'Let us (Christians) no more sabbatize,' he says, (that is, keep the seventh day, as the Jews did), 'but let us keep the LORD'S DAY.' 'Let every one that loves Christ keep holy the LORD'S DAY, the queen of days, the resurrection day, the highest of all days.'"

REPLY.—Ignatius says no such thing. The epistle from which this quotation is taken is the "Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians." And what is the character of that epistle? It is spurious. It is a forgery. Ignatius never wrote it. The writers who bear witness to this fact are Calvin, Dr. Killen, Sir Wm. Domville, Robinson, and C. F. Hudson. The testimony of these

persons, and a reference to the sources from whence it is taken, the reader will find in the History of the Sabbath, pp. 211-214.

But more than this: This passage in this forged epistle of Ignatius would say nothing about the Lord's day whatever, had not the word day been fraudulently inserted by the translator. The words "Lord's day" are not found in the original at all. It speaks of Lord's life," but says nothing about "Lord's day." Our authorities on this point are Kitto in his Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, Morer, and Domville. See Hist. Sab., pp. 214-216, where the facts are stated at length.

Thus, this "unanswerable" testimony of Ignatius, which has bolstered up thousands in the false idea that the first Christians kept Sunday in place of the Sabbath, is found to rest only upon a two-fold forgery. In some of the earlier centuries of the Christian age, persons of mean abilities fell into the very laudable and innocent (?) habit of writing shallow treatises, and then, to give them notoriety, ascribing them to some great names in the church. This will account for the number of such works that originated in that period.

Preble.—"Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, about A. D. 162, says: 'Both custom and reason challenge from us that we should honor the LORD'S DAY, seeing on that day it was that our Lord Jesus completed his resurrection from the dead.'"

REPLY.—Kitto, in his Cyclopedia of Religious Literature, Art. "Lord's Day," says that the *earliest authentic* instance in which the name of Lord's day is applied to Sunday is not till it is so used by Tertullian, A. D. 200. And the celebrated historian, Neander, says that perhaps at the end of the second century a false appli-

cation of the Sabbath law to Sunday had begun to take place, and quotes the words of Tertullian to prove it. If this is correct, that the earliest authentic instance of its use is A. D. 200, the assertion that Theophilus so used it in A. D. 162 cannot be authentic. For this latter statement, no authority is given. For the other, we have the authority of Kitto and Neander, and hence we choose this. Our opponents can take that which they think most creditable to their candor and honesty.

Preble.—"Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, a disciple of Polycarp, who had been the companion of the apostles, A. D. 167, says, 'On the LORD'S DAY every one of us Christians keep the Sabbath, meditating on the law, and rejoicing in the works of God.'"

REPLY.—Irenæus says no such thing. Sir Wm. Domville, an able, English, anti-Sabbatarian writer, speaks as follows concerning this quotation from Irenæus: "I have carefully searched through all the extant works of Irenæus, and can with certainty state that no such passage, or any one at all resembling it, is there to be found. The edition I consulted was that by Massuet (Paris, 1710); but to assure myself still further, I have since looked to the editions by Erasmus (Paris, 1536), and Grabe (Oxford, 1702), and in neither do I find the passage in question."

Dr. Dwight is referred to as authority for this language of Irenæus', whenever any reference is given. On this point, Domville remarks:

"Where, then, did Dwight obtain this testimony, which has so many times been given as that of Irenæus? It is recorded in a biographical memoir, prefixed to his theology, that by some disease in his eyes he was deprived of his capacity of reading and study from the early age of twenty-three. The knowledge which he

gained from books after the period above mentioned was almost exclusively at second hand, by the aid of others."

The same writer states another fact which unquestionably gives us the origin of this quotation.

"But although not found in Irenæus, there are in the writings ascribed to another father, namely, in the interpolated epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians [that forgery which we have just noticed], and in one of its interpolated passages [forgery upon forgery], expressions so clearly resembling those of Dr. Dwight's quotation, as to leave no doubt of the source from which he quoted."

On this testimony no better remarks can be made than those found in the History of the Sabbath, pp. 235, 236: "Such, then, is the end of this famous testimony of Irenæus, who had it from Polycarp, who had it from the apostles! It was furnished the world by a man whose eye-sight was impaired; who in consequence of this infirmity took at second-hand an interpolated passage from an epistle falsely ascribed to Ignatius, and published it to the world as the genuine testimony of Irenæus. Loss of eye-sight, as we may charitably believe, led Dr. Dwight into the serious error which he has committed; but by the publication of this spurious testimony, which seemed to come in a direct line from the apostles, he has rendered multitudes as incapable of reading aright the fourth commandment, as he, by loss of natural eye-sight, was of reading Irenæus for himself. This case admirably illustrates tradition as a religious guide: it is the blind leading the blind until both fall into the ditch!"

Preble.—"Tertullian, who died A. D. 245, says: 'The LORD'S DAY is the holy day of the Christian

church. We have nothing to do with the Sabbath (that is, the Jewish Sabbath). The LORD'S DAY is the Christian's solemnity."

REPLY.—We should have been glad if Eld. P., or Justin Edwards, had told us in what part of Tertullian's writings this extract was found. It is certain, from what testimony can be found from him, that appears to be genuine, that he did not base the observance of Sunday on the fourth commandment, nor believe in spending the day in devotion altogether. Milman, in his notes on Gibbon, speaks thus of Tertullian: "It would be wiser for Christianity, retreating upon its genuine records in the New Testament, to disclaim this fierce African, than identify itself with his furious invectives, by unsatisfactory apologies for their unchristian fanaticism." And Dr. Heylyn says: "Tertullian tells us that they did devote the Sunday partly unto mirth and recreation, not to devotion altogether; when, in a hundred years after Tertullian's time, there was no law or constitution to restrain men from labor on this day in the Christian church." It also appears that the great reason he assigned for keeping Sunday was opposition to those Christians who kept the Sabbath. See Hist. Sabbath, pp. 238-241.

Preble.—"Barnabas, who, if not a companion of the apostles, lived in the apostolic age, says, 'We (Christians) keep the eighth day'—that is, the first day of the week—as a joyful holy day, on which day also Jesus arose from the dead."

REPLY.—And here is Barnabas; the epistle of Barnabas, the most barefaced forgery of all! Barnabas, whose epistle, or the one ascribed to him, contains things too indecent for public print! The very ink should blush that is used to write down this Barnabas as a genuine Christian father. A few sentences will

serve to show the sweeping condemnation passed by standard authorities on this unworthy epistle.

"The epistle of Barnabas was the production of some Jew of mean abilities and superstitious attachment to Jewish fables, . . . a very different person from the true Barnabas who was St. Paul's companion."—*Mosheim*.

"Impossible that it could ever have proceeded from the pen of a man divinely instructed."—*Id.*

Neander, Dr. Killen, and Prof. Stuart speak in a similar strain.

"The letter still extant which was known as that of Barnabas, even in the second century, cannot be defended as genuine."—*Prof. Hackett*.

"The so-called epistle of Barnabas, probably a forgery of the second century."—*Kitto*.

Eusebius says, "Among the spurious must be numbered . . . the epistle of Barnabas."

Domville says, "The epistle was not written by Barnabas; it would be a disgrace to him, . . . a disgrace to Christianity."

Coleman says, "The epistle of Barnabas . . . is evidently spurious. It abounds in fabulous narratives, mystic, allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament, and fanciful conceits, and is generally agreed by the learned to be of no authority."

And Robinson speaks of it as the contemptible rev-
ery of a wild and irregular genius. See *Hist. Sabbath*,
pp. 206-209, 214.

With great pity for the cause that is dependent up-
on the support of such weak impositions, we pass on.

Preble.—"Athanasius, who died A. D. 326, says,
'The Lord transferred the Sabbath to the LORD'S
DAY.'"

REPLY.—Like all the rest, there is no reference given
us to the chapter and verse where this testimony from
Athanasius can be found. He is represented as say-
ing "The Lord transferred the Sabbath to the Lord's
day." If so, when did he do it, or where has he in-
spired any of his servants to record the fact. Point
us to the testimony and it sufficeth us.

It will be noticed that the date of this testimony is
A. D. 326. As this was subsequent to the days of
Constantine, a statement of a few facts may here be
in place.

1. Up to the time of Justin Martyr A. D. 140, more
than a hundred years after the resurrection of Christ,
no authentic testimony can be found that Sunday was
observed in any manner in the Christian church.

2. The first authentic instance of the application of
the term Lord's day to Sunday, was not till A. D. 200.

3. No law existed enforcing Sunday observance pre-
vious to the edict of Constantine, A. D. 321. Constan-
tine's edict is the fourth commandment for Sunday
keeping.

4. Until the days of Constantine, Sunday had not
been devoted to rest from labor, even by those who
did in some measure regard that day; for Constan-
tine's law did not prohibit husbandmen from laboring
on that day, but restrained only those who dwelt in
the cities, yet Mosheim tells us that this law caused
Sunday to be observed with greater strictness than it
had formerly been.

5. But this edict of Constantine's, this fourth com-
mandment for Sunday, was issued by him while he
was yet a heathen, and was in behalf of Sunday as a
heathen festival; for the date of this edict is A. D. 321,

accustomed to put to them this question: '*Dominicum, servasti?*'—Hast thou kept the LORD'S DAY?' If they had, they were marked as Christians. This was the badge of their Christianity. And if they said they had, and would not recant, they must be put to death. And when they continued steadfast, what was their answer? '*Christianus sum; intermittere non possum*'—I am a Christian; I cannot omit it. It is a badge of my religion, and the man who assumes it must of course keep the LORD'S DAY, because it is the will of his Lord; and should he abandon it, he would be an apostate from his religion.'

REPLY.—About all that need be said to this quotation is, that there is not a word of truth in it. It was not till the early part of the seventeenth century that this story was brought forward. Dr. Andrews, bishop of Winchester, England, then produced it to refute Thraske, who was contending for the seventh day. He claimed to have taken it from the "*Acta Martyrum*." But Sir Wm. Domville states that he has carefully consulted the most complete edition of that work, and he affirms that no such question as that can be found as having ever been put to the martyrs. Forgery. But what about this work called "*Acta Martyrum*?" Is it an authentic work? Mosheim states that it is spurious, entitled to no sort of credit whatever. Another forgery. So here we have it again, forgery upon forgery. Surely the prophet used appropriate language when he spoke about a "refuge of lies." Isa. xxviii, 17.

Preble.—"Eusebius, 'one of the most learned and eloquent men of the Christian church,' and called the 'Father of Ecclesiastical History,' and who died about A. D. 339, in his 'Commentary on the Psalms,' in commenting on the ninety-second Psalm, says: 'The Word (Christ) by the new covenant, translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning

light, and gave us the true rest, viz., the saving LORD'S DAY; the first (day) of the light, in which the Saviour of the world, after all his labors among men, obtained the victory over death.' 'On this day, which is the first of the light and of the true Sun, we assemble, after an interval of six days, and celebrate holy and spiritual Sabbaths—even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world—and do those things, according to the spiritual law, which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath; for we make spiritual offerings and sacrifices, which are called sacrifices of praise and rejoicing.'"

REPLY.—Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, book i, chap. iv, distinctly affirms himself to be a no-Sabbath man. He may have borne the testimony relative to the first day of the week here ascribed to him; for he was but the flatterer and satellite of the emperor Constantine. See testimony concerning him in Hist. Sabbath, p. 263.

Preble.—"Theodoret, another Ecclesiastical Historian, who died about A. D. 460, speaking of the Ebionites, a party of Judaizing Christians, says: 'They keep the Sabbath according to the Jewish law, and sanctify the LORD'S DAY in like manner as we do.' Haeret. Fab. ii, 1. 'This,' says Prof. Stuart, 'gives a good historical view of the state of things in the early ages of the church. The zealots for the law wished the Jewish Sabbath to be observed as well as the LORD'S DAY; for about the latter there appears never to have been any question among any class of christians, so far as I have been able to discover. The early christians, one and all of them, held the first day of the week to be sacred.'"—Sabbath Manual, No. 2, pp. 3-126.

REPLY.—It seems that, since Prof. Stuart penned the above, others "have been able to discover" further testimony relative to this question. Some of this has already been laid before the reader, and reference given him where more may be found. Enough has been

given to show that so far from the early Christians, one and all of them, holding the first day to be sacred, not one of them held it to be sacred previous at least to the heathen edict of Constantine, A. D. 321.

Preble.—"Says Mosheim:—'All christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week on which the triumphant Saviour arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the express appointment of the apostles, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout all the christian churches, as appears from the united testimony of the most credible writers.'—*Mosheim's Mosheim, Cent. 1, part II, chap. 4, Sec. 4.*"

REPLY.—Mosheim was a writer of the eighteenth century. Of course then, he was dependent on the writings of the early ages of the gospel dispensation, for the facts which he here states. The only writings that are extant previous to the time of Justin Martyr A. D. 140, are the epistle of Barnabas, Pliny's letter to Trajan, and the epistle of Ignatius. The epistles of Barnabas and Ignatius are both forgeries, as we have seen. The letter of Pliny speaks of a "stated day" but says nothing of what day it was. Hence there is nothing to support Mosheim's statement. On the contrary all history sustains the statement of Neander who was a writer of the nineteenth century, and equally credible with Mosheim. He says, "The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance; and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the law of the Sabbath to Sunday."—*Rose's Neander, p. 186.*

Preble.—"Enough of such testimony has been presented to prove that two SABBATHS were observed in the days of the apostles and early christians. The 'party of Judaizing christians' kept the seventh day. Those who followed Christ and the apostles kept the first day. And thus it *has been and is now*; those who follow the *Jews*, or the teaching of the old dead 'school-master,' will of course contend for the seventh-day Sabbath. But those who *have followed, and still do follow*, the teachings of the LIVING JESUS and the apostles, will observe the *first-day Sabbath.*"

REPLY.—From the few brief facts which we have thus far introduced into this reply, it will be evident that those who adhere to the word of God, and reverence the testimony of the Father and the Son, will adhere to the Sabbath which God instituted, blessed and sanctified for man; while those who choose to follow the "mother of harlots," will bow to the offspring of paganism and papacy, which she has chosen to adopt as the badge of her authority and power, and keep the first-day Sabbath. We agree with Eld. P. that "enough of such testimony," as he has adduced, has been presented; for on matters which pertain to our eternal interests, we want testimony that is reliable and true, not that which is born of corruption and fraud, and handed down to curse future generations, through the medium of a "pious credulity."

Preble.—"Two OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—The first is founded on Matt. xxiv, 20: 'But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day.' The Sabbatarian contends that by this passage the Saviour recognized the sacredness of the seventh-day Sabbath up to this time, surely. But we shall see. Two distinct things Jesus told the disciples to pray for. This is plain. All, I presume, understand that Christ had told the disciples that Jerusalem was to be destroyed by the Roman army; and when they, the disciples,

should 'see Jerusalem compassed with armies,' then they must 'flee to the mountains.' But, in doing so, they were liable to meet with *two obstacles*, and only two. Therefore they must *pray*. Pray for what? *Pray* that your 'flight be not in the winter, neither on the SABBATH DAY.' If their *flight* should happen in the winter, it would be difficult for the disciples, with their families, to live in the *mountains*. If their *flight* should happen on the *Sabbath day*, they would find it extremely difficult to 'flee' out of Jerusalem, as the gates would be closed, according to Jewish law and custom. (See Ex. xvi, 29; Neh. xiii, 18-22). This being the case, Jesus knew well that those who were so tenacious of their traditions of the Sabbath as to lead them to condemn him as a *Sabbath-breaker* for restoring the withered hand, so that it was made 'whole, like as the other,' and for making a woman straight whom *Satan* had bound and bent over, or bowed together, so that she could in no wise lift up herself for *eighteen years*, and all this just because Jesus had done these acts of mercy on the Sabbath. I say, Jesus knew well that such hypocrites would be a great hindrance to the disciples if their flight should take place on the Sabbath. Now consider, Christ had told the disciples to leave Jerusalem when they should see it compassed with armies. Was Christ Lord also of the Sabbath? So he had once said. Why, then, should he direct his disciples to pray that their flight might *not* occur on the Sabbath day? The just inference is this: Christ really being 'Lord of the Sabbath,' the disciples would have a perfect right to leave Jerusalem at any time when Christ told them to. And, therefore, if the Jews would not let them leave when Christ had ordered it, it proves that those old hypocrites had so monopolized all the privileges of that day by their *traditions*, that even the disciples could not obey the Lord Jesus without praying to God to prevent them from falling into the hands of such wicked men, who were so outrageously bigoted in regard to the Sabbath that they would neither let Christ or his followers do that which was *right* on that day. Hence, the Sabbatarian finds nothing here to prove a sacred regard for the seventh-day

Sabbath, *but a wicked perversion of all its rights*, by a class of men who were enemies to God, and violent oppressors of his people."

REPLY.—This labored attempt to prove that Christ, in Matt. xxiv, 20, did not recognize the existence of the Sabbath at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, shows that it rests with some weight upon the mind of Eld. P., and must in some way be disposed of. He avails himself of the usual and only method of attempting to evade its force. Now, if his explanation should turn out to be not in any wise valid, it follows that the testimony must stand as an express recognition on the part of the Saviour of the existence of the Sabbath, and a declaration to his disciples of his tender regard for that sacred institution. Had Eld. P. made himself acquainted with a few facts connected with the siege and fall of Jerusalem, we think he never would have offered the explanation of this language that he has here given us. The subject is so well and briefly set forth in the History of the Sabbath, that we can do no better than to quote from that work, pp. 184-188:

"But it is replied that this last petition has reference only to the fact that the Jews would then be keeping the Sabbath strictly, and, as a consequence, the city gates would be closed that day, and those be punished with death who should attempt to flee; and, hence, this petition indicates nothing in proof of Christ's regard for the Sabbath. An assertion so often and so confidently uttered, should be well founded in truth; yet a brief examination will show that such is not the case. 1. The Saviour's language has reference to the whole land of Judea, and not to Jerusalem only: 'Let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains.' The closing of the city gates could not therefore affect

the flight of but a part of the disciples. 2. Josephus states the remarkable fact that when Cestius was marching upon Jerusalem, in fulfillment of the Saviour's token, and had reached Lydda, not many miles from Jerusalem, 'he found the city empty of its men, for the whole multitude were gone up to Jerusalem to the feast of tabernacles.' (Jewish War, book ii, chap. xix.) The law of Moses required the presence of every male in Israel at this feast, in Jerusalem (Deut. xvi, 16); and thus, in the providence of God, the disciples had no Jewish enemies left in the country to hinder their flight. 3. The Jewish nation being thus assembled at Jerusalem, did most openly violate the Sabbath a few days prior to the flight of the disciples; a singular commentary on their supposed strictness in keeping it at that time. Thus Josephus says of the march of Cestius upon Jerusalem, that

"He pitched his camp at a certain place called Gabao, fifty furlongs distant from Jerusalem. But as for the Jews, when they saw the war approaching to their metropolis, they left the feast, and betook themselves to their arms; and taking courage greatly from their multitude, went in a sudden and disorderly manner to the fight, with a great noise, and without any consideration had of the rest of the seventh day, although the Sabbath was the day to which they had the greatest regard; but that rage which made them forget the religious observation [of the Sabbath] made them too hard for their enemies in the fight.' Jewish War, book ii, chap. xix.

"Thus, it is seen that on the eve of the disciples' flight the rage of the Jews toward their enemies made them utterly disregard the Sabbath! 4. But after Cestius encompassed the city with his army, thus giv-

ing the Saviour's signal, he suddenly withdrew it, as Josephus says, 'without any reason in the world.' This was the moment of flight for the disciples, and mark how the providence of God opened the way for those in Jerusalem:

"But when the robbers perceived this unexpected retreat of his, they resumed their courage, and ran after the hinder parts of his army, and destroyed a considerable number of both their horsemen and footmen: and now Cestius lay all night at the camp at Scopos, and as he went off farther next day, he thereby invited the enemy to follow him, who still fell upon the hindermost and destroyed them.' Jewish War, book ii, chap. xix.

"This sally of the excited multitude in pursuit of the Romans was at the very moment when the disciples were commanded to flee, and could not but afford them the needed facility of escape. Had the flight of Cestius happened upon the Sabbath, undoubtedly the Jews would have pursued him upon that day, as under less exciting circumstances they had, a few days before, gone out several miles to attack him upon the Sabbath. It is seen, therefore, that whether in city or country, the disciples were not in danger of being attacked by their enemies, even had their flight been upon the Sabbath day.

"There is, therefore, but one view that can be taken relative to the meaning of these words of our Lord, and that is, that he thus spake out of sacred regard for the Sabbath. For, in his tender care for his people, he had given them a precept that would require them to violate the Sabbath, should the moment for flight happen upon that day. For the command to flee was imperative the instant the promised signal should be

seen, and the distance to Pella, where they found a place of refuge, was at least sixty miles. This prayer which the Saviour left with the disciples would cause them to remember the Sabbath whenever they should come before God. It was, therefore, impossible that the apostolic church should forget the day of sacred rest. Such a prayer that they might not at a future time be compelled to violate the Sabbath was a sure and certain means of perpetuating its sacred observance for the coming forty years, until the final destruction of Jerusalem, and was never forgotten by that early church, as we shall hereafter see. The Saviour, who had taken unwearied pains during his whole ministry to show that the Sabbath was a merciful institution, and to set aside those traditions by which it had been perverted from its true design, did, in this, his last discourse, most tenderly commend the Sabbath to his people, uniting in the same petition their own safety and the sacredness of the rest-day of the Lord."

Preble.—"The second objection is, 'THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE.' What is this third angel's message? Why, a late theory has been started, which claims that Rev. xiv, 12, has special reference to a particular class of persons who believe in keeping 'the commandments of God,' as mentioned in this verse; and that these commandments have special reference to the 'Seventh-day-Sabbath.' The passage reads:—'Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.' It will be seen by the passage itself that it refers to the 'commandments of God'—all of them—and not to any particular one. How, then, shall we determine what commandments are referred to? Please notice the last clause in the verse, 'and the faith of Jesus.' This proves that the commandments referred to are those of the New Testament; for there was no 'faith of Jesus' before Christ came the first time. Be not alarmed,

kind reader, this will be proved by the word of truth, an unerring guide. Hear:—'But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterward be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.' Gal. iii, 23-25."

REPLY. Eld. P. has scarcely succeeded in concealing the latent feeling of contempt with which he speaks of the "third angel's message." Says he, "What is this third angel's message? Why, a late theory has been started," &c. But one thing is certain. There is an angel brought to view in Rev. xiv, the third of a series, who has the most terrific warning to utter that can anywhere be found in the word of God. It signifies something, and the nature of the warning renders it of the utmost importance that we should understand it. Sneers will not set it aside nor destroy its signification. It would be better for Eld. P. to have told us what it does mean, if our exposition of it is not correct, than to have treated it as he has. One singular misstatement needs correcting on the start. This "late theory," he asserts claims that "these commandments have special reference to the seventh-day Sabbath." Where did he learn this? He certainly did not get it from any Seventh-day Adventist writings. It would be agreeable if our opponents would not manufacture so many positions for us. We believe it has no more special reference to the Sabbath than to the other nine commandments. But we do believe that the commandments there referred to, mean specifically the ten commandments of God, all of them, Sabbath with the rest. We have more to say, of course, about the Sabbath commandment than about the oth-

ers; because that is the one which the world has been taught to violate, and on which consequently, light needs to be given.

In connection with this misstatement in fact we must mention a misstatement in logic, which Eld. P. has made in putting forth his effort to prove that the commandments referred to are the commandments of the New Testament. The clause "and the faith of Jesus," he says, "proves that the commandments referred to, are those of the New Testament; for there was no faith of Jesus before Christ came the first time." We would fain believe that from some cause Eld. P. overlooked the little word "and;" for certainly no one who gets a clear idea of the construction of the language, can draw from it the conclusion presented by Eld. P. It does not read, Here are they that keep the commandments of God—the faith of Jesus; but the commandments of God *and* the faith of Jesus. The commandments of God are one thing, the faith of Jesus another. Now what is this faith of Jesus? We affirm that it embraces all the precepts and teachings of Christ given us in the New Testament; and if this be so, the commandments of God spoken of in connection, are not the same thing, but commandments brought over from the Old Testament. Let any one apply it to any other than the ten commandments if he can.

Preble.—"No one need be surprised to see men, and women too, run into error when they will keep themselves 'shut up unto the faith,' but never come to it. Why will men be so blinded as to have faith in the visions of women instead of the visions of John? Why follow the teachings of the *old dead 'schoolmaster'* instead of following the *LIVING JESUS*? They thus give countenance to the system for taking away sins on the head of a live goat! I would exhort all such to—'BE-

HOLD THE LAMB OF GOD, WHICH TAKETH AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD.' John i, 29.

REPLY.—When Eld. P. commenced his articles against the Sabbath of the Lord, we had hoped he would be able to go through with them without descending to the contemptible practice so common with a certain class of our opponents, of appealing to the prejudice of narrow minds, by heaping slurs upon the visions. But it seems he has not succeeded. The intense desire to give the "visions of women" at least one thrust, before closing his argument against the Sabbath, overcame him, and hence this exhibition of himself. It only confirms our opinion that it is scarcely possible for the opponents of the law of God, to write to any length against the Sabbath, without betraying the spirit spoken of in Rev. xii, 17. At least we have yet to see such an article where this spirit did not in one part or another unmistakably crop out: The text referred to says that the dragon was wroth, and went to make war with the remnant of the church "which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." And the testimony of Jesus Christ is defined in chap. xix, 10, to be the "spirit of prophecy."

There are those who are constantly watching for just such things as Eld. P. has here thrown out, and great is their glee when they can find a morsel over which to gloat. Accordingly no sooner had the above remark appeared in the Crisis from the pen of Eld. P. than the Millennial Harbinger announced in a most jubilant strain that Eld. Preble had written through the World's Crisis, a *series of articles* against the Sabbath, and the *visions of E. G. White*. So soon did this one remark against the visions become expanded into

a series of articles! We hope Eld. P. will not feel flattered at this appreciation of his efforts. We would that it might open his eyes to the nature of the work in which he is engaged.

But again the "old dead schoolmaster" is brought on to the stage and a new application made of his mortal remains. This time he is set forth to represent "the visions of women!"

Preble.—"THE CONTRAST. The objector may ask, why there is such a contrast between my present views and those advocated by me when I observed the seventh day? as strong grounds are taken in both instances; and both arguments are drawn from the Bible. The answer is obvious. In my former argument, in favor of the seventh day, I had for my basis the *Old Testament*. And as my premises were *false* my conclusions were *wrong*! But in my present position my basis is the *New Testament*; consequently, as my premises are now true, my conclusions are therefore *right*."

REPLY.—Eld. P. should not be quite so fast here. It is true that false premises lead to wrong conclusions; but it is by no means as certain that, if a person's premises are correct, his conclusions will be right, for conclusions are often drawn as wide of the premises as the east is from the west, and the reader has had sufficient evidence that Eld. P. sometimes draws conclusions with quite a rapid hand. But what does he mean about his basis being the *Old Testament*, and consequently his premises false? Is the *Old Testament* false? Is it opposed to the *New*? We had supposed that the Bible was one harmonious whole, not two parts arrayed in antagonism to each other. Then we repeat a question or two which we have already asked: Where, except in the *Old Testament*, do we find any law prohibiting the worship of images; or

where else any regulations prohibiting consanguinity in marriage?

But in looking at Eld. P.'s former argument, we fail to see that his basis was the *Old Testament*. We have his tract before us. The first part of the tract is an extract from the writings of Wm. Miller, in which there are eight references to the *Old Testament* and four to the *New*. In what Eld. P. himself wrote we find twenty-two references to the *New Testament*, and only two to the *Old*. One of these was to the fourth commandment, which he quoted on his title-page, and the other was to Dan. vii. 25, to show that the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, by the papal power, was in fulfillment of that prophecy.

What his basis was, will still further appear from a couple of extracts from the tract referred to, which the reader will be pleased to see in this connection. In a prefatory note to the reader he says:

"A FEW QUESTIONS FOR THE READER TO ANSWER, BEFORE READING THE FOLLOWING PAGES.—What authority have you in the *Old* or *New Testament* to keep any day as a Sabbath, or day of rest? Do you find any command in the *New Testament*? If not, why do you not observe the day that is appointed in the fourth commandment? Has the day ever been changed? If so, *when* and *where*? Please point to the chapter and verse."

Yes, we would like the chapter and verse. We will let the reader decide whether Preble of 1864 is able to answer the questions of Preble of 1845. Again, he says, p. 7:

"In relation to the practice of the apostles, there is but one meeting of the disciples on the first day of the

week mentioned in the New Testament, and that is in Acts xx, 7. But there are many meetings recorded which they held on the Sabbath. I know 1 Cor. xvi, 2, is considered proof respecting the first day; but when examined, I think it proves the contrary. It says, 'Upon the first *day* of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him,' &c. The expression, 'lay by him in store,' I think plainly implies that they were at home, rather than at meeting. Rev. i, 10, is the only other place that can be construed to favor the first day. John says, 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' Now, who knows whether he meant the first or the seventh day? I think the latter, because it is called 'the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,' but the first is nowhere called so!! In regard to the Sabbath, Christ says, 'The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.' Not *a* Sabbath, but *the* Sabbath. He says also, 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.' Mark ii, 27, 28. He does not say, *the* Sabbath was made for the Jews, and *a* Sabbath for the Gentiles, but 'THE Sabbath was made for man'—all mankind."

It will be seen from the above that Eld. P. once occupied a position for which he could give a valid reason. He has exchanged it, alas! for one for which no just ground can be found, either in nature, reason, history or revelation.

Preble.—"In conclusion. I now propose to all Sabbatharians, as I have spoken once more upon the subject of the Sabbath, that if they think my present position is unscriptural, and can be shown to be such, I will just say, without bigotry or vanity, that if they desire, and will present a man well qualified to defend their side of the question, I will, by the Lord's permis-

sion, meet him at any proper time and place, and we will have this matter tested."

REPLY.—With this closing paragraph, a reviewer, of course, has not much to do. Sincerely believing his present position to be unscriptural, we have endeavored to present a few reasons for so regarding it. If Eld. P. is not satisfied, men will not be wanting, at any proper time and place, to further test this matter with him.

We are thus brought to the conclusion of Eld. P.'s effort against the Sabbath. The reader now has before him, from the pen of a representative man, arguments which have been set forth with all confidence as sufficient to overthrow the seventh-day Sabbath. Let us, in a brief retrospect, look at some of their main features in connection.

1. In the first place, the Sabbath is set forth as a type. But to make this position even appear plausible, the question of its origin must be kept out of sight; for the Bible distinctly places the origin of the Sabbath in Eden; but it is impossible that any type should originate before the fall. And further, the Sabbath as a type is said to foreshadow the future thousand years of millennial rest and glory. But the idea must be maintained that the Sabbath was abolished at the cross; hence, we have a break, a great gulf of over eighteen hundred years, between the shadow and the substance!

2. The Sabbath is incorporated into the very bosom of the decalogue, one of those precepts which God distinguished above all others by speaking them with his voice, and writing them with his finger, thus showing that, one and inseparable, they were in their nature moral, immutable, and perpetual. But the Sabbath

must be abolished, hence the whole decalogue must be abolished; for it is impossible to show any action in regard to one commandment which does not equally affect them all. This is the reason we hear so much about the ten commandments being abolished. It is simply and exclusively to get rid of the Sabbath, which is such a trouble to the lawless and disobedient. And having abolished the decalogue, mark the dilemma they are in, and the work they make in trying to extricate themselves from it. The law must be re-enacted, or a new one given. When? Some say by Christ, during his public ministry; but this was before the crucifixion, where only the abolition of the old can be placed; hence, we have a re-enactment some years before the old was abolished. Others, therefore, contend that the apostles gave the new law; but this was many years this side the crucifixion, leaving a large space in which God had no law for the government of his creatures! And the thought also occurs that for the former age, an age, as they hold it, of comparative darkness, God gave his law himself; but for this age of further light and glory, he retires upon the background, and leaves the giving of his law to men!—positions, all of them, too absurd for sane and sensible men to give them a moment's adherence.

3. Christ is also, in reality, set forth as dying to abolish his Father's law, which, if it could by any means have been abolished, he need not have died.

4. The original decalogue is denounced as a yoke of bondage, the letter that killeth, a curse, the old law of works, the "old dead school-master," &c.; but their law of the New Testament, which they must contend is exactly identical with it, only the obligation of the Sabbath is transferred to another day,—that is the law

of faith, the law of liberty, the Spirit that giveth life, more glorious! &c. Such is the consistency of their theory.

5. The arguments they use destroy each other. Being compelled to admit that the Sabbath is a moral law, that nullifies the argument that it is a type; for moral laws have nothing typical in their nature. Then Paul's language is applied to the Sabbath, "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind," to show that the observance of days is a matter of entire indifference; which, interpreted in accordance with their theory, must mean that we must observe Sunday, but need not keep the seventh day. We shortly find that if we observe the seventh day, we fall from grace, and will surely be accursed; and, finally, that by so doing we tread under foot the Son of God, and count the blood of the covenant wherewith we were sanctified an unholy thing, and do despite unto the spirit of grace! Thus it becomes the most heinous crime against God, to keep a command under this dispensation, which under the former was the delight of both God and man, and for a violation of which, God visited his ancient people with frequent and severest wrath! And more than this, while we must not keep the seventh day, the divine law for which never has been repealed, we must keep Sunday, for which no divine law or command ever has been given!

Such are a few of the crooks and contradictions which attach to any theory devised to overthrow the Sabbath. They are inherent in the system, if it may be called a system, and no man, however able and sound in other respects, who undertakes to defend such views, can run clear of them. And if the reader, in following the arguments of Eld. P., has often been

surprised at the inconsistency and weakness of his positions, attribute it not to the man, but the unfortunate side of the question upon which he labors. For no man of his age and ability, of his fairness and candor in every other respect, of his experience in the things of God, and especially in connection with the great truth of the second coming of the Saviour,—no such man, we say, with truth on his side, would advance the incongruous positions, and the lame and halting arguments which he has presented. But error disarms the strongest, and renders him who would be a host, if battling for the right, weak and impotent in its unworthy defense. For this reason, we are sorry to see Eld. P. where he is, and for his own sake, and the good he would be able to do, we would that he might return to his first love, and again take up his position in the stronghold of truth.

Says the apostle, "Rebuke not an elder, but intreat him as a father." In the spirit of this injunction, Eld. P. will suffer us to address a few words to him.

Permit us, Eld. P., to point out to you the nature of the work in which you are engaged. It is a negative work, akin to that of the skeptic and infidel. It is tearing down, not building up. And you well understand that it is vastly easier to hurl an objection here and there against any system than it is to present another harmonious system to take its place. And such is the opposition to the seventh-day Sabbath, whether it take the form of no-Sabbath, or of a first-day Sabbath. It consists principally in throwing out objections, one text here and another there, which is supposed to bear against the great system which sustains the seventh day from Genesis to Revelation. And it matters not if these objections contradict and devour

each other, as there is no harmonious system on that side to build up; but if they work confusion in the mind of the reader or hearer, and shake his confidence in the Sabbath, the object is gained. And who are the persons, Eld. P., who especially delight in your effort against the Sabbath? Answer. Those who believe in no-Sabbath. What care they for a poor apology for Sunday? They know that if the seventh day is not the Sabbath, there is none. Hence, they seize upon every objection that you raise against the Sabbath as sustaining them in their position. Thus are you confirming men in this species of infidelity; bolstering them up in the idea that the holy and beneficent institution of a day of rest has ceased to exist. And while this negative work is so easily accomplished, it is not so easily counteracted; as it is well known that an objection may be stated in one line, which it would require pages to answer. To illustrate: One man can tear up more railroad track than ten men can lay down; one incendiary can burn more buildings than a hundred men can build; and it requires only a few hours' work of the club and torch of the Goth and Vandal, to deface or ruin the stately edifice, which it has cost years of toil, and the mightiest efforts of art, to rear. Such, Eld. P., and we say it with all kindness, is the nature of your opposition against the Sabbath. But amid all the controversy and excitement which this subject is producing with various classes, we are happy to be able to say that

Like some fair monument of towering form,
The Sabbath stands unmoved amid the storm;
While round it fierce the noisy rabble crowd
With tumult wild, and imprecations loud;
Their missiles at it hurl with venom'd spite,
To mar its beauty and obscure its light;

And "More Confusion," is their proper label, "Than ever babbled 'round the tower of Babel."

You must not, therefore, be surprised if in some portions of our reply to your remarks, we have manifested more than wonted earnestness, and if our words may have seemed sharp and severe. Be assured that nothing has been set down in unkindness or malice. While we have endeavored to expose faithfully wrong premises and wrong conclusions, it has been with no hard or bitter feelings against their author. We have spoken only as the occasion seemed to demand. For when we saw you yielding to a class of ideas which led you to apply to Seventh-day Adventists, those who are endeavoring to regulate their lives by the highest moral code yet known on earth,—to apply to this class the language of Paul to the Philippians, "Beware of *dogs*, beware of *evil-workers*, beware of the *concision*," &c., it seemed to us time that the inherent falsity and unsoundness of such positions should with an unsparing hand be laid open to public view.

With no less sincere feelings of regard for your position, age and experience, have we reviewed your arguments, than we felt when, at the home of the writer, in West Wilton, N. H., twenty years ago, you made known in clearness and power the doctrine of the Lord's soon coming; or when you laid your hand upon his head, and said, "Bub, do you love the Lord Jesus?" We can now answer that question. We do love him. We take him for our Saviour. And while endeavoring to keep the law of God, we rely upon the merits of Christ's atoning blood for the forgiveness of our sins. And the more we love him, the less consistent can we make it appear that by obeying the law of the Father, we thereby ignore or trample under foot the atoning work of the Son.

In contrast with the lack of harmony involved in the opposition to the Sabbath, look at the few following harmonious facts connected with the view we hold of this sacred institution.

1. The Sabbath was given to man in Eden, ere yet he had fallen from his innocence.

2. A law for its observance was given to Adam, and through him, as he then stood in Eden, of course for all his posterity.

3. When the moral law was given to the world in tangible form, we beheld the Sabbath, in its very bosom, the golden clasp to bind together the two tables of the decalogue.

4. God declared to Israel that he would take the Sabbath commandment above all others to be the badge or sign of his loyal people.

5. We see the Sabbath, with the other nine commandments, everywhere kept distinct from the ceremonial law, which regulated, not obedience to God, but the way to approach unto him for pardon.

6. And when Christ came and introduced a new and better way of approach to God, he was careful to hold up the law of his Father, unchanged in the slightest particular, as still the great rule of rectitude, and the condition of everlasting life. If thou wilt enter into life, said he to the young man, keep the commandments. And he then pointed him to the decalogue to show him to what commandments he referred.

And 7. When the prophet Isaiah looks beyond this present evil world, beyond the reign of corruption and error, beyond the dominion of sin and sinners, when he looks forward to a new earth reposing in untold loveliness and beauty beneath a new heaven, he gives us a final view of the Sabbath in that glorious and

eternal state: "For as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. lxvi, 22, 23.

Thus while the Sabbath was placed like a bright coronet upon the brow of the first creation, ere Paradise was lost, while it has been, and still is, "the song of the church in the house of her pilgrimage," in Paradise restored it again appears, prominent among the blessings of the great restitution, and the prophet points to it as a season of hallowed repose and worship for the saints of God forever and ever.

We trust you still adhere to the noble sentiment expressed in your tract of 1845: "Truth is what I am after; and if I had but one day on this earth to spend, I would give up error for truth as soon as I could see it." We therefore pray you to review carefully your present position, and, as you then prayed, "May the Lord give you wisdom and help you to keep all 'his commandments, that you may have right to the tree of life.' Rev. xxii, 14."

And when the faithful servants of God shall have finally entered into rest, as they look back upon their journey through this revolted world where disloyalty to the government of Heaven was the prevailing sin, and where opposition to God's law was the malignant principle which the enemy labored hardest to instil into the hearts of men, and as they think that then they tried to show their loyalty to God by loving his law and reverencing his Sabbath, that thought will be to them an exceeding joy.

